

THE YEAR'S WORK IN ENGLISH STUDIES

VOLUME II

1920-1

Edited for

The English Association

BY

SIR SIDNEY LEE

and

F. S. BOAS



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
1922

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

PREFACE

THIS volume follows the general lines of its predecessor, which dealt with the period from November 1919 to November 1920. The survey is here carried on from the latter date to the end of 1921, although a few foreign publications earlier than November 1920 are noticed. In future *The Year's Work in English Studies* will, it is hoped, cover the publications of the calendar year previous to its date of issue.

The Editors have been able to enlist the services of an increased number of specialist contributors, who are responsible for the opinions expressed in the sections under their charge. Some rearrangement of the sections has thus been made feasible.

It will facilitate the production of *The Year's Work* if publishers and editors of periodicals, especially those appearing in America or on the Continent, will send copies of books or magazines at as early a date as possible to the Secretary of The English Association (4 Buckingham Gate, London, S.W.).

S. L.
F. S. B.

CONTENTS

I. LITERARY CRITICISM AND HISTORY.

GENERAL WORKS.

By ROBERT DEWAR, M.A., Professor of English
Literature in University College, Reading.

II. PHILOLOGY

By HILDA M. R. MURRAY, Director of Studies
in English and in Comparative and Historical
Philology, Girton College, Cambridge; and
LILLIAS E. ARMSTRONG, Assistant in the Depart-
ment of Phonetics at University College,
London.

III. ANGLO-SAXON STUDIES.

By EDITH E. WARDALE, M.A., Tutor in English,
St. Hugh's College, Oxford.

IV. MIDDLE ENGLISH

By MARGARET L. LEE, M.A., Tutor to the Society
of Oxford Home Students, and Lecturer in
University College, Reading.

V. THE RENAISSANCE

By ARTHUR W. REED, M.A., Reader in English
Language and Literature in the University of
London.

~~VI.~~ SHAKESPEARE

By Sir SIDNEY LEE, D.Litt., F.B.A., Professor
of English Language and Literature in the
University of London.

	PAGE
VII. ELIZABETHAN DRAMA	81
By FREDERICK S. BOAS, LL.D., F.R.S.L., formerly Professor of English Literature in Queen's College, Belfast.	
VIII. THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD. POETRY AND PROSE	101
By H. J. C. GRIERSON, D.Litt., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the Uni- versity of Edinburgh, and ARTHUR MELVILLE CLARK, M.A. With additions by the EDITORS.	
IX. THE RESTORATION, 1660-1700	116
By the Rev. MONTAGUE SUMMERS, M.A., F.R.S.L.	
X. THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY	127
By EDITH J. MORLEY, Professor of English Language in University College, Reading.	
XI. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, I. 1800-1860.	149
By C. H. HERFORD, D.Litt., Honorary Professor of English Literature in the University of Manchester.	
XII. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, II. 1860-1900.	175
By H. V. ROUTH, M.A., Reader in English Language and Literature in the University of London.	
INDEX	187

THE YEAR'S WORK IN ENGLISH STUDIES

VOLUME I. 1919-20

EDITED BY SIR SIDNEY LEE

	PAGE
I. LITERARY CRITICISM AND HISTORY. GENERAL WORKS.	7
By ROBERT DEWAR, M.A., Professor of English Literature in University College, Reading.	
II. PHILOLOGY. GENERAL WORKS	20
By HILDA M. R. MURRAY, Director of Studies in English and in Comparative and Historical Philology, Girton College, Cambridge.	
PHONOLOGY	28
By LILLIAS E. ARMSTRONG and I. C. WARD, Assistants in the Department of Phonetics at University College, London.	
III. ANGLO-SAXON STUDIES.	32
By EDITH E. WARDALE, M.A., Tutor in English, St. Hugh's College, Oxford.	
IV. MIDDLE ENGLISH	39
By MARGARET L. LEE, M.A., Tutor to the Society of Oxford Home Students, and Lecturer in University College, Reading.	
V. THE RENAISSANCE	49
By ARUNDELL ESDAILE.	
VI. SHAKESPEARE AND ELIZABETHAN DRAMA	53
By Sir SIDNEY LEE, D.Litt., F.B.A., Professor of English Language and Literature in the University of London. With additions by FREDERICK S. BOAS, LL.D., and the Rev. MONTAGUE SUMMERS, F.R.S.L.	
VII. THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD. POETRY AND PROSE	78
By FREDERICK S. BOAS, LL.D., F.R.S.L., formerly Professor of English Literature in Queen's College, Belfast.	
VIII. THE RESTORATION, 1660-1700	92
By the Rev. MONTAGUE SUMMERS, M.A., F.R.S.L.	
IX. THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY	101
By EDITH J. MORLEY, Professor of English Language in University College, Reading.	
X. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER	115
By the Rev. MONTAGUE SUMMERS, M.A., F.R.S.L.	
INDEX	134

I

LITERARY CRITICISM AND HISTORY GENERAL WORKS

[By ROBERT DEWAR]

THE general history of literature seems to be out of favour with scholars. Those who might reasonably make the venture prefer to limit themselves to the survey of a special period, or to the evolution of some particular type, or to the examination of some phase or aspect of the larger theme. It is a sign of growth and progress, no doubt. But the monograph-maker, with his habit of peering into crannies and raking the rubbish-heaps of the past to parade his particle of discovered truth, has much to answer for. It is small wonder if the task of writing literary history on any large scale grows harder and harder with every year. Even the attempt to conquer the difficulty by collaboration must fall short of complete success: we must be content to accept an unequal story, troubled with lapses, or a story that walks the highway of plain fact to the blistering of patience.

Under the circumstances, Sir Henry Newbolt's *English Anthology*¹ looks like a hint at a way out. But no more than a hint. For to tell the story of our literature on this model, allowing those who made that literature to speak for themselves—though a master of ceremonies may marshal them and assign their parts—would demand something resembling rather a 'corpus' than an 'anthology'. Title and preface alike suggest a book for the use of historical students of English. We are not to expect another

¹ *An English Anthology of Prose and Poetry, showing the main stream of English Literature through six centuries (14th century–19th century)*. Compiled and arranged by Henry Newbolt. J. M. Dent, 1921. x+1011 pp. 10s. 6d. net.

'portable collection of gems'; for 'in no case has a piece been chosen without some definite reason beyond its literary excellence'. This prose and verse garner is designed in its widest intention 'to illustrate national life in thought', or more specifically 'to show the progress of the English language and literature as the gradual gathering of many tributaries into one stream, or of many characters and influences into one great national concourse'. It might be described as a systematized collection of documents towards a literary history of the English people. The experiment of such an anthology was worth making; and Sir Henry Newbolt deserves all praise for the way in which he has done his work. The only regret one feels is that the book was not allowed to run to double or even treble its present size. It is not only that more might have been included. A greater room would have given freer play to the principle on which the anthology is arranged—a principle which, though simple, is at once its chief novelty and its most characteristic excellence. 'The idea of the book', we read, 'is that wherever the reader chooses to open it, he shall have (in abridgement) upon the left hand all the effective content of the literary mind at that date: and upon the right hand, all that was still to come'. And so the order of arrangement adopted is 'the order in which the great writers of English made their decisive appearance'. Simple and easy of application, surely. But we find that the work of Chaucer and of Shakespeare must be divided each into two separate periods, that of the translators of the Bible and of Milton each into three. And Sir Henry Newbolt has to confess that, 'as only a few illustrations can be given of even a great writer's work, the gradual growth of his influence and its possible changes, cannot be adequately shown'. Why not give the anthologist more steering room, and let his course be determined by the effective appearance of books (printed or circulating in manuscript, as the facts may require) rather than by the decisive appearance of writers? It seems a legitimate extension of the principle, and one that would minimize, if not always remove, the difficulties by the way. But perhaps it was set aside as threatening too much a 'corpus' to be feasible. If so, let us have the 'corpus' too. For this anthology heads in the right direction; and its quality is sufficient guarantee that Sir Henry Newbolt is the man who could make the elaboration better than another.

One other book that covers the whole field deserves mention—Professor Strong's *Short History of English Literature*.² This is a regular history upon the old-fashioned lines; and in his prefatory note the author is inclined to apologize for writing it. 'A partial justification', he says, 'may be found in the attempt here made to bring the treatment of the subject abreast of recent research and criticism'. Dr. Strong—who, by the by, excludes from his survey living authors and all those who are not British-born—has no call to be so modest. His book is very much more than a mere bringing up to date of previous works in the kind. Compact and well-proportioned in its parts, and written in a crisp, economical style, it contrives to handle its theme with a freshness and fullness that preserve it at once from falling into the category of hand-books, and from defaulting in the other direction through over-ambitious emulation of the larger-scale history. Dr. Strong, in a word, has given us a real short history; and his book is to be commended not by this or the other particular feature, but by the witness of its high and sustained quality to the author's fitness for such work. Not every one can write a short history which makes good reading on its own account, and which yet possesses the higher and farer merit of remaining after all the humble usher to a greater presence.

Among histories of a less wide range, histories that might be described as chapters in the larger story, *The Laureateship* by E. K. Broadus³ might stand as a model of how such things should be done. A fine piece of scholarship, careful of the smallest relevant detail, and patient to the last degree in research that all difficulties may be resolved and decided, this story of the office of poet laureate in England is at once beautifully proportioned, full and illuminating, and charged with an interest surprising in the subject.

Mr. Broadus gives about a fourth of his space to legendary and

² *A Short History of English Literature*, by Archibald T. Strong, M.A., Litt.D., Associate Professor of English Language and Literature in the University of Melbourne. Humphrey Milford, 1921. xii + 404 pp. 8s. 6d. net.

³ *The Laureateship, a study of the office of Poet Laureate in England, with some account of the poets*, by Edmund Kemper Broadus, Professor of English at the University of Alberta. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. viii + 240 pp. 15s. net.

traditional poets laureate, that the development of the laureate tradition prior to the formal inception of the office in 1668 may be set in a clear light. Not a word of this prelude is wasted. How the title of poet laureate grew by suggestion from the academic custom of laureation at the conferring of the baccalaureate is here demonstrated; and the confusion attaching to those fanciful lists of poets laureate to be found in our earliest historians of literature and others is here set straight. The new material unearthed in these opening chapters is of value in itself. But Mr. Broadus is still more to be congratulated on his application of this new material to the clearer definition of terms and to the elucidation of a piece of literary history hitherto vague and only half intelligible.

It is to be noted indeed as a virtue in Mr. Broadus that he is not given to announcing his own particular discoveries at the expense of the proportions of his subject: they fall from his pen, here and everywhere, as it were casually in the course of the narrative. There is the generous episode, for example, in the prefatory pages, that stays to interpret for us Suckling's *Session of the Poets*. It is a familiar poem; and the curt reference of a foot-note would have been some men's way. But Mr. Broadus graciously rests his reader by giving text; and the familiar becomes for the first time in history really perceptible under his exposition of it as primarily a document significant of a growing interest in the laureateship idea.

Nor does he drop this pleasing habit in the later and principal chapters of his book. Here Mr. Broadus's task was perhaps more to arrange and interpret material already in some degree known than to present us with new discoveries. From Dryden to Mr. Bridges the story is that of an established institution: documents are plentiful and plain in reference: and Mr. Broadus's division, presenting three phases, is both lucid and convincing. He has chosen, however, to combine with his main discussion of the characteristics of the office some account also of the poets laureate themselves. And so even here new matter crops out on occasion: a careful reader will note many a corrected error of detail, some of wider bearing and importance than their unobtrusive mention might seem to imply. Thus, to quote but two examples, Dryden's pensions and his change of religion are topics that grow clearer for us

Dunciad is given its proper background of a contemporary view. Even the dullest phase of the laureateship in the eighteenth century is made to yield profitable and interesting reading, as Mr. Broadus applies research to bring alive and render humanly knowable such minor poets as Rowe, Eusden, Cibber, Whitehead, Warton, and Pye.

A Short History of the English Drama, by Benjamin Brawley,⁴ 'makes no special effort to be either original or profound. It aims simply to set forth in brief compass the main facts that one might wish to have at hand in his first course in the English Drama'. It is, in fact, a compilation, and leans upon larger histories of the subject. It covers the field from the beginnings to our own time, not excluding living playwrights.

In Professor R. P. Baker's *History of English-Canadian Literature to the Confederation*⁵ we have a sign of the awakening of Canada. The judgement of literature displayed is somewhat erratic, forgetful at times of standards reached in English literature as a whole. Professor Pelham Edgar's shorter account in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* is both clearer and more assuring. But the truth is that Professor Baker's book rather belies its title. He has seen fit to attempt a sketch of English civilization in Canada prior to 1867; and the literature he discusses is apt to assume significance accordingly. It is this larger aim, no doubt, that dictated consideration of 'only those authors of Canadian descent who maintained their connexion with their native country and those of European birth and education who became identified with its development. Within these limits,' he continues, 'I hope to portray the life and temper of the English-Canadian people, to trace their literary relations with Great Britain and the United States, the two countries with which they have been most intimately connected, and to determine their intellectual origin'. Here is matter for a good book and a desirable. And Professor Baker has so essayed the task that the debt

⁴ *A Short History of the English Drama*, by Benjamin Brawley. London: Harrap [1921]. ix+260 pp. 7s. 6d.

⁵ *A History of English-Canadian Literature to the Confederation: Its Relation to the Literature of Great Britain and the United States*. By Ray Palmer Baker, Ph.D., Professor of English in the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (London: Humphrey Milford.) 1920. x+200 pp. 10s. 6d. net.

of English-Canadian culture, through the 'Loyalist' tradition, to the United States is plausibly argued; though talk of the 'Americanization of Canada' is declared to be 'folly'. The argument of the book in short recognizes—perhaps was inspired by—that 'development of national consciousness' which its author notes as 'the chief feature of the last four decades' of Canadian life and history. National consciousness apparently has produced national pride. And Canada begins to examine her past that she may establish distinctions. We may cavil at the form, even at the title, of Professor Baker's book, and regret that he did not give us outright a history of English-Canadian thought and civilization, illustrated perhaps by reference to literature, but also and more fully by reference to other phases of the subject as vitally significant. The book is, nevertheless, a happy omen, the sign of an awakening for which we are grateful.

Mr. Withington's *English Pageantry*⁶ seems to have been ready for the press in 1914. Delay in publication has enabled him to continue the work and to add material as late as 1919. 'An historical outline' is our author's description of these bulky volumes. So Fleay or Ritson or any of our nineteenth-century antiquaries would have chosen to describe the work; which indeed is strangely reminiscent, in method and composition, of the way of the antiquary with history. Historians and readers of to-day are more likely to regard it as the materials for such an outline, to wish that more space had been given to critical comment as against citation of evidence, and that some, at least, of the evidence adduced had been less indirectly relevant. But the way of the antiquary, perhaps, is as good as another with a subject so fallen to bits by usage that the very words 'pageant' and 'pageantry' have long ceased to carry any definite meaning. The boundaries of the subject need rediscovering and redefining as the first step towards historical discussion. And 'beating the bounds' is a ceremony plainly to Mr. Withington's taste. From the opening chapters, which enumerate the heterogeneous elements of the pageant and examine the various sources—folk and other—from which these elements have been derived or borrowed; through the elaborate

⁶ *English Pageantry: An Historical Outline*, by Robert Withington. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (London: Humphrey Milford.) Vol. I. 1918. xx+258 pp. • 17s. net. Vol. II. 1920. vi+435 pp. 25s. net.

reports, both in their flourishing and in their decay, of the 'Royal-Entry' and the 'Lord Mayor's Show'; to the discussion of the twentieth-century or 'Parkerian' pageant—it is obvious that a principal aim of this work is to fix a meaning upon the terms 'pageant' and 'pageantry', that its drift is towards definition and classification. The pity of it is that when you have sifted the true from the false and have got the warrant of history for a comparatively lucid definition of early pageantry (i.e. of pageantry as it was known prior to 1900); you are faced with Mr. Louis N. Parker and his 'Parkerian' variety, born at Sherborne in 1905: and your work is all to do again. Mr. Withington sees the difficulty: and the chief value of his work lies in its mapping of the two regions. A bibliography, extensive though not complete, a very full index, two pages of corrections and additions inserted at the end of the second volume, and illustrations contribute to its usefulness.

A useful contribution to knowledge upon a dry and difficult subject is Dr. F. R. Amos's *Early Theories of Translation*.⁷ The author's desire to keep 'within measurable limits' has led her to confine her attention—unfortunately for the interest of her monograph—to 'such opinions as have been put into words', and to avoid 'making use of deductions from practice other than a few obvious and generally accepted conclusions'. This involves, she confesses, 'the omission of some important' (and, we might add, some of the most suggestive) 'elements in the history of the theory of translation, in that it ignores the discrepancies between precept and practice, and the influence which practice has exerted upon theory'. Her book resembles the more, in consequence, a lopped and withering branch, though it may show well enough as belonging once to a proper tree. For the theory of translation, as explicitly worded in English, is a thing of no uniform or even approximately uniform advance. It exists to little or no purpose, a sort of parasite upon the body of literature. Dr. Amos's monograph is eloquent on almost every page of the futility of hoping that the opinion (say) of a theorist of the sixteenth century will

⁷ *Early Theories of Translation*, by Flora Ross Amos, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of English in the College for Women, Western Reserve University. New York: Columbia University Press. (London: Humphrey Milford.) 1920. xvi+184 pp. \$2.00 net.

show any awareness of the notions of earlier men, or that it will meet the gaze to aid any theorist who may succeed him. The theorists indeed might utter their *obiter dicta*: they spoke into the wind. And least of all were they heeded by the actual practitioners of the art, who are apt to perform better than they know, inspired by other than technical motives. Even Chapman, though he has some theory to offer, seems unable to explain how and why his *Iliads of Homer* is so successful an experiment; and the Preface to the Authorized Version at most only hints indirectly at the root-causes of the excellence of the greatest of all translations. But, of course, Dr. Amos has a perfect right to limit the range of her inquiry as she chooses; and under a sort of self-denying ordinance, she has patiently collected and passed in review what there is in English of theory of translation down to the end of the age of Pope. It is convenient, to say the least, to have this scattered material brought between the boards of a single volume. Nor is it always dead-head wisdom that Dr. Amos brings from the past. She has a Dryden among her people, who, referring to Roscommon's rules for translation, writes: 'Many a fair precept in poetry is like a seeming demonstration in the mathematics, Very specious in the diagram, but failing in the mechanic operation.' And Dr. Amos, before quoting these words, had already made the same admission of the inadequacy of any theory to inspire, or even to explain, all that gives quality and distinction to the best translations. 'For in translation there is involved enough of creation to supply the incalculable element which cheats the theorist.'

Mr. Omond's name is well known among prosodists. He is one of a very few who can write upon English verse without turning 'crank'. He has his views, and can express them tersely and with vigour enough; but he rides no hobby-horse, for truth is dearer to him than a reputation for singularity. All the more welcome are the reprint of his *Study of Metre*,⁸ and the new edition of his *English Metrists*.⁹

⁸ *A Study of Metre*, by T. S. Omond. Reprinted from the first edition. London: Alexander Moring, Ltd., 1920. xvi+159 pp. 7s. 6d.

⁹ *English Metrists: being a sketch of English prosodical criticism from Elizabethan times to the present day*, by T. S. Omond. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. viii+536 pp. 10s. 6d. net.

The new issue of *A Study of Metre* is an exact reprint of the first edition, save for some 'trifling verbal corrections'. Quotations sounding the advance in the forefront of the book from Campion and Swinburne, 'Longinus', Probus, and Lessing—all alike emphasize hearing as the court of appeal in questions of metre: and in keeping with this, a feature of Mr. Omond's study is the regular deduction of theory, wherever possible, from consideration of examples. Its method alone will commend the book to the wise. Nor will its substance disappoint; for Mr. Omond at least simplifies the subject, and makes use of terms so explicit and so clearly defined that his meaning is never in doubt. The thesis maintained counters the view which seeks the basis of our metre in words or syllables. 'All verse', Mr. Omond argues, 'is conditioned by time'; and what recurs with regularity to supply the basis sought is 'the time-spaces or periods of duration in which syllables are, as it were, embedded'. 'Temporal uniformity underlies syllabic variety.' And so Mr. Omond supports the view that '*isochronous periods* form the units of metre. Syllabic variation gets its whole force from contrast with these, is conceivable only in relation to these'.

English Metrists recasts into one volume the two original parts of this work, published respectively in 1903 and 1907, and brings the record down to the end of 1920. The work offers a full bibliography of English writings on metre, summarizing and criticizing the contents of each. Books that contribute in Mr. Omond's opinion to the development of sounder views about verse-structure receive fuller treatment at his hands. But no book, whatever its view, is unjustly reported. Nor does it appear that Mr. Omond has omitted anything of importance from his long list. *English Metrists* is a book that no future historian of our prosody can afford to ignore.

Professor Pound's *Poetic Origins and the Ballad*¹⁰ contradicts the teaching of the late Professor Gummere and of 'communal' theorists generally. The point of view and the range of her book are given clearly in the opening sentence of her preface. 'The leading theses of the present volume are that the following assump-

¹⁰ *Poetic Origins and the Ballad*, by Louise Pound, Ph.D., Professor of English in the University of Nebraska. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921. x+247 pp. \$2.50.

tions which have long dominated our thought upon the subject of poetic origins and the ballads should be given up, or at least should be seriously qualified; namely, belief in the "communal" authorship and ownership of primitive poetry; disbelief in the primitive artist; reference to the ballad as the earliest and most universal poetic form; belief in the origin of narrative songs in the dance, especially definition of the English and Scottish traditional ballad type as of dance origin; belief in the emergence of traditional ballads from the illiterate, that is, belief in the communal creation rather than *re-creation* of ballads; belief in the special powers of folk-improvisation; and belief that the making of traditional ballads is a "closed account". This attack upon doctrines that have been developed since Child gave a new impetus to ballad-study, but that very probably would not have found favour in his sight, cannot be called surprising; for ingenious speculation and extravagant inference have long injured the work of 'communal' theorists, and sufficed to bury from view any element of truth their position may have held. Professor Pound, like some earlier critics unheeded in their day, makes use of ballad 'chronology'—of the date of recovery or recording of ballads in manuscript or print—as an argument for her side. But she rests far more upon analogy with folk-song products that are known as such, whether from the past or from the present; and the evidence she brings to bear from ethnological and kindred researches is perhaps the strongest and most valuable part of her book on its destructive side. On its constructive side, the chapter on 'The English Ballads and the Church' is perhaps the most interesting and worthy of attention. Professor Pound here argues for an origin of balladry similar to the origin of our drama. Her own summary of this new hypothesis may be quoted. 'The alternative possibilities (granting that religious ballads are an early type) are: that short narrative lyrics on ecclesiastical themes emerged directly from clericals and that the type was later secularized; or that they emerged from the minstrels, and ecclesiastics availed themselves of the type; or that minstrels were solely responsible for the early religious ballads, composing them for audiences for whom they were specially suitable. But when lingering over these hypotheses, one is inclined to give the church a greater share of responsibility for the earliest ballads than the third hypothesis assumes.' This suggestion, says the author,

'is based on fact, not conjecture'. Certainly it 'deserves to be taken into account, alongside the hypotheses of ballad origin which have been brought forward in the past'.—The disappointing side of Professor Pound's monograph is its form rather than its matter. The greater part of the book is a reprint (with modifications and additions) of papers that had already appeared in various periodical publications. And the author herself enters an apology for their 'polemical tone' which 'is to be accounted for by the fact that each was written to urge a distinctive point of view or to oppose some accepted position, i.e. was a piece of special pleading. It was impossible', she adds, 'to eliminate the argumentative note without re-writing the articles *in toto*.' It is a pity this extra labour was not undertaken, not merely for the sake of improving the tone, but to rid away a certain amount of overlapping and repetition that puts a drag at times upon the even flow and development of the argument. If it should prove that Professor Pound has not finally laid the ghost of the 'communal' theorist, the reason for her failure will be found to lie less in the spell she chose for that purpose than in her mode of pronouncing it.

If new histories of literature are difficult to produce and scarce in our day, no obstacle seems to check the flow of books and essays of general theorizing, especially about poetry. The tale of such requiring notice here is not yet ended. From Harvard we have *A Study of Poetry*, by Bliss Perry; from Ireland, *The Realm of Poetry*, by Stephen J. Brown, S.J.; while Professor Herford contributes a paper entitled 'Is there a poetic view of the world?'

Professor Bliss Perry's volume¹¹ depends in some degree from an earlier publication of its author's. The method of studying poetry here followed is that set forth some years ago in Professor Perry's chapter on 'Poetry' in *Counsel upon the Reading of Books*. The 'genetic' method, he calls it; and refers to its 'threefold process of impression, transforming imagination, and expression'. The aim seems to be to study poetry after the order of its creation; and this order, in Professor Perry's view, might be put as follows: a poem originates in an impression delivered upon a poet—this

¹¹ *A Study of Poetry*, by Bliss Perry, Professor of English Literature in Harvard University. London: Constable. n. d. x+396 pp. 12s. 6d.

impression (whatever its nature or source) in its passage through the mind of the poet suffers transformation under the force of his imagination—expression is given to the impression thus transformed and a poem results. Professor Perry believes that his method is ‘the natural way of approaching the subject’. But he is aware that insistence upon any one method with poetry—even his—risks the danger of declining upon worship of a formula; and perhaps the title of his book reflects this in its unassuming use of the article. *A Study of Poetry* certainly does not read like the composition of a rigid ‘methodist’ or rule-monger. Arranged and supplemented with material to fit it for use in the classroom—by careful and perceiving instructors only, let us hope, for the book’s sake—its general style and tone suggest a much wider appeal. To the making of both parts of this study—to the first which discusses ‘Poetry in general’, and to the second which treats of ‘The Lyric in particular’—there has gone a vast amount of reading. Indeed, the desire to be up-to-date and full in reference to the ‘literature’ of his subject sometimes blunts the edge of our author’s pronouncements; and his hold upon his audience would perhaps have been more uniformly strong if on occasion he could have allowed the extent of his learning to remain in some doubt. But there is another side to the account. Professor Perry is for all points of the compass. And if he fetches cargoes from the critics of poetry, he adventures as freely among the poets themselves, brightening his pages with quotation and anecdote, as happy and illuminating as they are various.

The Realm of Poetry by S. J. Brown¹² is a book on pretty much the same subject as Professor Perry’s; but it is another sort of book. Professor Perry ruffles it, quite pleasantly, in all his robes, and talks by preference to those who know; his desire is to impart more knowledge. Mr. Brown puts on no ceremony, and would as soon be telling his story to the first casual man he should meet as to the most learned pundit: his aim is simply to instil a taste, to give a bent to the mind and make it ripe for the receipt of knowledge.

Mr. Brown’s book is in three parts, with a prologue and an epilogue. His first step is to seek an answer to the question

¹² *The Realm of Poetry: an Introduction*, by Stephen J. Brown, S.J. London: Harrap. [1921.] 220 pp. 5s. net.

‘What is Poetry?’ The form, the subject-matter, and the spirit of poetry are separately considered before he settles to the discussion of some leading definitions of poetry, and to the framing of a description of his own. This description ‘aims at nothing more than to be intelligible and, so to say, popular’; and to be appreciated it should really be met in the body of the book. Yet it may be quoted here as suggesting by its parts the author’s interpretation of the terms form, subject-matter, and spirit. ‘Poetry’, we read, ‘is the art which expresses in metrical and otherwise fitting or congruous language, self, life, nature, God, and all their interactions realized or apprehended in a mood of emotional and imaginative exaltation.’ It is apparent from this that Mr. Brown considers metre essential to poetry: for the rest, even to the implication that not all metring can be allowed as poetry, Sidney would not have quarrelled with our author. Something suggestive of Sidney also there is in his turning next after definition to reflect upon the things that poetry can do for us—his second part. His third part—‘Learning to love Poetry’—is more practical still, having to do with method, and indeed discussing in one section ‘the systematic study of a poem’. The Epilogue is on ‘The “Mission” of Poetry’, and gives occasion to challenge as exaggerated the claims of those who would have poetry independent of morality or a religion in itself. But though we get exhortation, it does not grow to homily: our author’s care for poetry is a sufficient check. Mr. Brown has made a book that should find grateful readers among the teachers of literature for whom it is designed—a book that talks at ease and affectionately about its theme; and that reveals its author less as the schoolmaster of to-day than as something which most of us have regretted as long lost from the earth, the dominie who educated youth before the days of specialization broke him up into half a dozen schoolmasters.

Professor Herford’s inquiry—‘Is there a poetic view of the world?’¹³—is approached, perhaps unconsciously, by Mr. Brown. ‘Dare we claim for poetry’, he writes, ‘that it may teach us a

¹³ In *Shakespeare’s Treatment of Love and Marriage, and other Essays*, by C. H. Herford, Honorary Professor of English Literature in the University of Manchester. London: T. Fisher Unwin. [1921.] 201 pp. 10s. 6d. net. (pp. 145-201.)

new attitude toward life as a whole, or at least toward a great part of our daily and hourly experience, an attitude that we may call the *poetic* outlook upon things, as contrasted with the *practical*.¹ Professor Herford's '*poetic world-view*' is something more particular, and contrasts with those we name *religious* and *philosophical*. There is no question of establishing a sort of hierarchy of values, of setting one world-view above or below another. Professor Herford—noting that the religious and the philosophical conceptions of the world are founded in two distinct types of elemental experience—argues simply for the recognition of a 'third kind of experience, distinct from that of either religion or philosophy, yet involving an apprehension of reality comparable in originality, and possibly in importance, with theirs'; and claims that 'such an experience is given in and by poetry'. Poetic experience may seldom show pure, unaffected by religious or philosophical ideas, but it never fails to modify these. And by learned and subtle examination of the character or direction of these modifications in 'certain commanding poet natures', both ancient and modern, Professor Herford develops his thesis; and finds that the light which guides to a poetic view of the world is, in some form or other, 'the faith that spiritual energy is the heart of reality'.

Theories of fiction threaten to become as numerous as essays in poetics. Two books on the novel must be noticed here.

The Art of the Novelist, by Professor Lathrop,¹⁴ sits lightly to its title; but this will not damage it with the audience addressed. It is a book popular in design; 'meant for those who have unreflectively and sympathetically read so many novels that they have begun to think about them, who have lived within the realm of the story-teller long enough to have some standards and ideals of their own, but have not defined those standards and ideals and thought them out into clear consciousness'. To spread rather than to increase knowledge has been the author's aim, and both matter and style are according. With nothing very new to report, he can set out the knowledge of the *virtuosi*, in a way sufficiently fresh and individual to justify his claim to 'some authority as an

¹⁴ *The Art of the Novelist*, by Henry Burrowes Lathrop, Associate Professor of English in the University of Wisconsin. London: Harrap. [1921.] xii + 291 pp. 6s.

older soldier in speaking with his comrade readers'; and if at times he slips into the jargon of the hasty reviewer, his manner has perhaps more of the virtues than of the vices of fluency. No chapter is without something to attract and interest; the best perhaps, in which our author goes more beneath the surface, is that on 'Setting.'

In *The Craft of Fiction*¹⁵ Mr. Percy Lubbock addresses a very different audience from Professor Lathrop's—a smaller audience, for certain; and an audience that has both read many novels and thought about them, till thought (it would appear) from over-exercise has taken a cramp. It was Sydney Smith who declared that 'the main question as to a novel is—did it amuse? were you surprised at dinner coming so soon? did you mistake eleven for ten, and twelve for eleven? were you too late to dress? and did you sit up beyond the usual hour? If a novel produces these effects, it is good; if it does not—story, language, love, scandal itself cannot save it. It is only meant to please; and it must do that, or it does nothing.' But the game of novel-making has been played hotly since 1826; and readers of taste begin to grow shy of confessing their love so vulgarly as this. Long ago they saw wrought the last of the 'permutations and combinations' possible with hero, heroine, and villain; and they cease, therefore, to be hypnotized by mere story, or by any of the conventional elements of story. The *élite* of the novel-reading public, they would seek and praise in novels a more subtle beauty. In the questions that define their approach to fiction, 'how' is like to supersede the more common 'what' or 'why'. Their cult is the cult of 'significant form'; and they would argue that in the novel, as in poetry—when indeed the argument has found able defenders—form is everything. If Mr. Lubbock has not come out to meet this new and select company on its way, he has at least put on his coat and contemplates the journey.

For *The Craft of Fiction* is an essay that denies the existence among us of anything worthy the name of criticism of fiction, and that blames for this state of affairs our wrongheaded way of reading novels. As readers, still more as critics of fiction, we must get rid of the habit of being most pleased when we can lose ourselves

¹⁵ *The Craft of Fiction*, by Percy Lubbock. London: Jonathan Cape [1921]. [viii]+277 pp. 9s. net.

in the world of a novel. For this habit it is that diverts the criticism of fiction from its proper object, fobbing us off with discussion of 'the writer', of 'the people in his book', of 'the kind of life he renders, and his success in the rendering'—topics that are beside the mark altogether. 'So far from losing ourselves in the world of the novel, we must hold it away from us, see it all in detachment', that we may give our whole attention to forming an 'image' of 'the novel itself', of 'the book [as] an object of art.'

It is a difficult quest, this quest of 'the book'. If Mr. Lubbock succeeds in luring us to the undertaking, it is only by his command of a style that never fails to express his subtlest notion, and by the courage of his own despairing enthusiasm. 'And after all', he says towards the end, 'it is impossible—that is certain; the book vanishes as we lay hands on it. Every word we say of it, every phrase I have used about a novel in these pages, is loose, approximate, a little more or a little less than the truth. We cannot exactly hit the mark; or if we do, we cannot be sure of it. . . . Such an ingenuous confession, I think it must be admitted, goes to the root of the matter—could we utter our sense of helplessness more candidly?' And yet *The Craft of Fiction* is neither more nor less than the demonstration of a way to achieve this 'impossible' quest: and the man who has nothing to learn from its pages, be he novelist or critic, is surely to be envied. 'The book' we would see may be a 'shadowy and fantasmal form', something more air-drawn than the dagger in *Macbeth*. If we are ever to behold it we must learn to recreate our novel after its author: and the 'one obvious way' to this skill is 'to study the craft, to follow the process, to read constructively'. Small wonder that the quest inspires at once enthusiasm and despair. For the 'way' lends dignity at least to the critic: 'the reader of a novel—by which I mean the critical reader—is himself a novelist.' And Mr. Lubbock—pursuing this 'way' with the small handful of novels he selects from Balzac, Flaubert, Tolstoy, Dickens, Thackeray, Meredith, and Henry James—if he seldom appears to capture his 'book', never fails at least to give one to think.

We may consider that Mr. Lubbock exaggerates when he says 'there is nothing more that can usefully be said about a novel until we have fastened upon the question of its making and

explored it to some purpose'—when he indicates the 'technical aspect' of novels as 'the business of criticism in the matter of fiction'. We may tax him also with assuming too readily that all reading (especially of novels) is for the ends of criticism. Surely he would concede that, if a Parson Adams or a Dugald Dalgetty can upset the designs of a Fielding or a Scott, even the most alert and cunning of readers may be excused for losing himself on occasion in the world of a novel, counting it a gain to do so. But quarrel as we may with the author of *The Craft of Fiction*, at the very least we must admit that he supplies us with a legitimate and not unprofitable gymnastic for the re-reading of a novel; and not a few will welcome a study of technique that, with all its ingenious subtleties, defines the 'form' it worships in terms of 'subject', and that, unlike so much of contemporary criticism of fiction, bears upon its pages the stamp of mind.

*The Teaching of English in England*¹⁶ is a chapter in the history of education and of educational theory deserving the special attention of students of English. It reports upon the state of English teaching in our schools of all grades and types, our colleges, and our universities, commending or criticizing the aims and conditions that advance or retard English study at the several stages; and it advocates a policy of improvement and reform for the future. The Committee responsible for this Report has gone to work thoroughly, taking full advantage of its 'reference'. As a consequence, though time and change may efface the novelty of many a particular suggestion, the Report is likely to remain memorable for its consideration of the principles that must underlie any scheme of national education—principles examined and enunciated to support another memorable feature, the sweeping claims advanced for English in our educational system. It is hardly to be expected that the new doctrine in its fullness will find ready acceptance in all quarters: prejudice and the love of established routine are not to be thrust down in a day. But the

¹⁶ *The Teaching of English in England: being the Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to inquire into the position of English in the educational system of England.* London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1921. xvi+394 pp. 1s. 6d. net.

skill and eloquence with which the case for English is here put encourage the hope that we have heard the last of that cheap scorn of the mother-tongue, which pronounced it valueless as a subject of study alike for knowledge and for discipline; while they also render impossible anything less than a fully-reasoned opposition to any detail whatever that may appear unacceptable.

II

PHILOLOGY: GENERAL WORKS

[By HILDA M. R. MURRAY]

ONE of the most important among recent contributions to linguistic studies is Professor Jespersen's *Language: its Nature, Development and Origin*,¹ published at the turn of the year 1921-22, in which the author develops and formulates his 'philosophy of speech', already outlined in earlier works. In his introductory survey he shows how the great scholars of the nineteenth century revolutionized linguistic studies by the introduction of the historical point of view, and turned from the wider speculations of their predecessors on the origin of speech, and the comparative valuation of languages, to more specialized investigations of linguistic change and development; but the insistence on the 'biological or biographical' conception of language as a living organism, and on the primary importance of its phonological and morphological developments, led to a tendency to think and speak of it as an abstraction, subject to 'a dogma of blind sound-laws', or as having a separate existence from the individuals who speak it. During the last thirty years the new attitude towards the study of the living speech inaugurated by Sweet has led to advances in linguistic science which bid fair to rival in importance those of the nineteenth century. The advance has been in the direction of humanizing the study of language, of considering it in its proper relation as a human function or activity. The study of phonetics has broken down abstract formulas of sound-change by insisting on the fact that 'the real life of language is in the mouth and ear, not in the pen and eye'; and the old isolative study of single words and sounds has given place to the new combinative study of words in connected speech as seen in the attention now paid to sentence phonetics, sentence stress, and to the science of semantics. As Professor Jespersen points out, the controlling force in linguistic

¹ *Language: its Nature, Development and Origin*, by O. Jespersen. London: Allen and Unwin. 8vo. 448 pp. 18s.

development is the need for intelligibility, which acts as a check upon the tendency of the individual towards changeability of speech-habits. 'Linguistic biology' is dealt with in the second and third sections of the book, which examine respectively the speech of children, and particularly the way in which a child learns to talk, as bearing upon the life and development of language; the influence of foreigners; and the part which individuals, or specific classes of individuals in general, play in linguistic development. The author holds that linguistic development is as a rule in the direction of economy of effort, and points out that no valid distinction can be drawn between phonetic and non-phonetic changes, since analogy (economy of brain) exercises in morphology an influence parallel to that exercised by ease (economy of effort) in sound-change.

The final section deals with the author's general conclusions. The 'energetic' view of language as a human activity leads inevitably to the valuation of languages from an anthropocentric point of view. Linguistic development is progressive since it is, in the main, in the direction of economy of effort, and that language must rank highest which accomplishes most with the minimum of effort. The old theories of linguistic decay ignore the superior flexibility of analytic modes of expression as contrasted with the rigidity of synthetic forms. Thus the logical simplicity of Modern English syntax, in which word-order has taken the place of grammatical inflexion, may well be contrasted with the greater rigidity and the complicated inflexional systems of the classical languages. In conclusion it is shown how the study of the linguistic development of the child and the individual, and the progress of languages in general, throw light on the problem of the ultimate origin of speech, which Professor Jespersen assumes to have begun with phrase- or sentence-units in which tone played an important part, rather than with words or roots. In his own words, 'the evolution of language shows a progressive tendency from inseparable irregular conglomerations to freely and regularly combinable short elements'.

It is impossible in so small a compass to give an adequate idea of the mass of material contained in this interesting and suggestive book. The author advances a sound and consistent theory of linguistic change and development, considered from the humane

point of view in relation to the combinative use of language as a means of intercourse and to the actual practice of individual speakers, presenting it in a readable form and compass which may well commend it to a wider circle than that of the professed linguist, while at the same time he suggests many new fields for the investigation of the latter. His theory inevitably leads him to attack wider and more speculative issues of a more controversial type, but the treatment throughout is suggestive and unprejudiced, and his conclusions are the logical outcome of his anthropocentric standpoint.

The practical bearing of the new attitude towards language on the learning of languages is seen in Mr. Palmer's *Principles of Language-Study*.² Mr. Palmer, like Professor Jespersen, considers language as a human function or habit, and the fundamental principle of his book is that language-learning is a habit-forming process, an art, not a science, and that the natural or spontaneous method, illustrated by the child learning to speak, is consequently far more successful than the studial. Further, since language is 'not an agglomeration of word-units but a means of communicating thoughts', the memorized matter should consist, as with the child, of ergons or speech-units, not of isolated word-units which are incapable of serving as a basis of combinative or constructed matter. Thus Mr. Palmer gives a practical application of the changed attitude towards language indicated by the importance attached to phonetics, and by the stress laid on the combinative view of language and on the value of child-study for linguistic purposes. His examination of methods and of the rational order of progression in practical language-study is sound and helpful in its discrimination between spontaneous and studial methods, and its suggestion of the right compromise between the direct and the indirect, and his exposition of the underlying principles of language-study will be of value to many students.

In his Inaugural Lecture,³ delivered at Oxford in February 1921, Professor Wyld pleads for a more living and fruitful study of

² *The Principles of Language-Study*, by H. E. Palmer. London: Harrap. 8vo. 186 pp. 6s.

³ *English Philology in English Universities*. Inaugural Lecture by H. C. Wyld. Oxford University Press. 46 pp. 2s. 6d.

philology at English Universities, pointing out how live and progressive a branch of learning the study of the living speech should be and what new fields of research await the trained band of young scholars whom it should be the work of the Universities to send out. In Professor Wyld's opinion this can best be done by the division of the old double-barrelled course of Language and Literature in such a way as to leave the specialist free to devote himself to one or the other branch, and to bring his studies into vital relation with the most progressive thought of the day.

Professor Weekley's *Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*⁴ includes 'the whole of the literary and colloquial vocabulary, so far as the former is not purely archaic and the latter not purely technical or local', and may therefore justly claim to be the most complete dictionary of our modern usage in existence. It is offered 'to those lovers of our language who, without wishing to stumble about in the dim regions which produce prehistoric roots and conjectural primitive-Teutonic word-forms, have an educated interest in words and an intelligent curiosity as to their origins and earlier senses'. To satisfy this intelligent curiosity the author has spread his net widely, admitting foreign words likely to occur in reading or conversation, proper names which come within the scope of historical or etymological interest, recent neologisms and war vocabulary, in so far as any of these categories have general currency or usage. A further new departure is the extension of the term 'etymology' to cover any points of interest in the history of a word, such as how, when, why, or by whom it was first introduced into the language, points which may well be of greater interest to the curious mind than the question of its ultimate *provenance*. Thus this dictionary is in a sense a dictionary of phrase and fable, and contains much delightful and curious reading, not only in its 'etymological' matter, but in the quotations, which have been selected for illustration in the same catholic spirit as the rest of the material. A number of interesting and independent solutions of etymological problems are also included. The book provides a valuable record of and commentary upon the present usage in literary and colloquial English, and ably justifies this

⁴ *An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*, by E. Weekley. London: Murray. xx+1659 pp. 42s.

further adventure of its author in the realms of the romance of words.

Professor A. Heusler, in his inaugural address at Bâle on *Northern Antiquities in their relation to West Germanic*,⁵ advocates the study of Scandinavian antiquities from the point of view of their importance for Germanic studies in general. Thus the Norse runic inscriptions throw light also on the development of the other Germanic languages; northern mythology on the primitive religion of the Germanic peoples in general; and early Scandinavian literature not only on their alliterative verse and common stock of heroic studies but also on their social life and customs. The evidence is clearly and concisely brought together in a brief and scholarly survey of the subject.

The literary and cultural relations of England and Scandinavia from their earliest beginnings up to the close of the Middle Ages form the subject of the sixth volume of *Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*.⁶ The author surveys the channels of intercourse established by the Scandinavian settlements in England and the subsequent relations between the peoples, and deals at length with their literary relations as traced by him in epic and romance, in books of instruction, and in popular legend and ballad up to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. A 'hypothetical chart' of foreign romances in Scandinavia is appended to the volume.

Professor Leo Wiener continues his attempt to overthrow 'the whole structure of Germanic history, philology, and palaeography' in two further volumes of his studies in Arabico-Gothic culture,⁷ in which he attributes the Gothic and Runic alphabets, Ulfilas, Jordane's *History of the Goths*, and Tacitus' *Germania* to 'wholesale literary and documentary frauds' of the eighth and ninth centuries on the part of the Goths in Spain, and the Greeks following in their wake. Professor Wiener attempts to prove the

⁵ *Das nordische Altertum in seiner Beziehung zum west-germanischen*, by A. Heusler. *Herrig's Archiv*, vol. 42 (n.s.). pp. 161-172. Berlin, 1921.

⁶ *Angevin Britain and Scandinavia*, by H. G. Leach. xi+432 pp. 12mo. Harvard University Press, London: Humphrey Milford. 15s. net.

⁷ *Contributions towards a History of Arabico-Gothic Culture*; iii. *Tacitus' Germania and other Forgeries*; iv. *Physiologus Studies*, by Leo Wiener. Philadelphia: Innes & Sons, 1921. 328 and 338 pp. "

fraudulent nature of all references to the Crimean Goths, and to show that the term Visigoths or Vestgoths implied merely Spanish Goths trading as silk merchants (*vestiarii*) in Russia, whereas Ostrogoths signified orientals, not Crimean Goths. Tacitus' *Germania* he regards as an elaboration of Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*. The whole theory presents an amazing story of frauds comparable only to those which some hold Bacon to have perpetrated in the works of Shakespeare and other Elizabethans.

Among new editions of important works may be mentioned the fifth edition of Paul's *Principles of Language*,⁸ and the third edition of his *Dictionary*,⁹ both revised shortly before the author's death. The *Principles of Language* shows little change, but the *Dictionary* has been much expanded both in words and in the addition of quotations, though the adoption of Roman type has spared much addition to the actual bulk of the volume. A second edition of Jespersen's *Engelsk Fonetik*¹⁰ has been carefully revised, particularly in the treatment of the sections on Tone and Stress. The year 1921 also witnessed the completion of Jakobsen's *Etymological Dictionary of the Norse Language*,¹¹ and the continuation of Luick's *Historical English Grammar*.¹² An interesting article on the origin and history of the pronoun *she* appears in the *Anglia* (January 1921).¹³

[By LILLIAS E. ARMSTRONG]

In their *Manual of Modern Scots*¹⁴ Mr. W. Grant and Dr. Main Dixon appear as jealous guardians of the ancient national speech

⁸ *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, by Hermann Paul. 5^{te} Auflage. Halle: Niemeyer. 42 mark.

⁹ *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 3^e Auflage. Halle: Niemeyer. 105 mark.

¹⁰ *Engelsk Fonetik*, by O. Jespersen. 2. udg. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel. 6 kr. 35.

¹¹ *Etymologisk Ordbog over det norrøne Sprog på Shetland*, by Jakob Jakobsen. Copenhagen: V. Prior, 1908-21. 4^{te} Heft, pp. 723-1032 + xlviii. 15s.

¹² *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, by Karl Luick. Lieferung 3 to 6. i. Leipzig: Tauchnitz. 15 mark.

¹³ *On the Origin and History of the English Pronoun She*, by H. Lindkvist-Anglia, XLV. i. (n. f. xxxiii), Jan. 1921. Halle: Niemeyer.

¹⁴ *Manual of Modern Scots*, by W. Grant and Main Dixon. pp. xxii + 500. Cambridge University Press, 1921. 20s. net.

of Scotland. They regard as traitors those Scotsmen who are unfaithful to it and who basely write Anglified Scots or Scottified English. In a chapter on the 'Intrusion of English into Scots', they urge that Scottish writers shall pay attention to the history of their language, its literature, its grammar, and that the study of the old national speech shall be fostered in the schools and colleges of Scotland.

The *Manual of Modern Scots* is an attempt to give to those lovers of Scottish literature—presumably of all nationalities—who have 'few or no opportunities of hearing the language in its spoken form', the power to enjoy the spoken language through the medium of their own voice. The writers hope that with the help of sections I and II (phonetics and grammar) the student will be able to read or recite the extracts given in section III with a pronunciation 'which would be recognized as Scottish wherever it is spoken'. It would be interesting to know what degree of perfection must be reached before this is possible.

In the first part of the book—Phonetics—the consonant and vowel sounds are described, and numerous examples are given of their occurrence in Standard Scots, and of variations from this standard found in many Scottish dialects. The examples are written in the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association; Scottish and English conventional spelling are also given. This section of the book is more generously treated than the corresponding one in *The Pronunciation of English in Scotland*, published by Mr. Grant in 1913: the examples are more numerous, and points of historical interest are introduced.

The second section deals with the grammar of Modern Scots, and numbers of very interesting examples from modern Scots writers are used as illustrations of the differences between Scottish and English usage.

More than half the book consists of a phonetic reader containing extracts from the masterpieces of modern writers and a selection of favourite ballads and songs. One extract gives a faithful record of the Scotch of the Glasgow working man (*Wee Macgregor*); another of the dialect of the North-east (*Johnny Gibb of Gushetneuk*); another of that of Galloway and Nithsdale (*Galloway Gossip*); another of the Teviotdale dialect of fifty years ago (from the story of Ruth). But the majority of the passages chosen record

that type of pronunciation which is regarded by the writers as Standard Scots and which is used by the educated middle classes over a large area of mid-Scotland.

The texts should be welcomed as much by those students of Scottish literature who *do* enjoy opportunities of hearing the spoken language as by those for whom they are chiefly intended, namely, those readers of Scottish literature scattered in all parts of the world who have little or no opportunities of hearing the language. We are inclined to think, however, that non-Scottish students would require a greater knowledge of phonetics than they can obtain from this book, together with help from the voice of a Scottish teacher, before they could succeed in reading or reciting the passages well enough to please the writers.

A work of this kind, treating of some of the more important forms of English and of a number of definite sub-dialects, would be a welcome addition to those publications in phonetic script already in existence which deal with the pronunciation of English in England.

III

ANGLO-SAXON STUDIES

[By EDITH E. WARDALE]

THE outstanding book for the year 1920-21 which deals with Old English is undoubtedly Dr. Chambers' Introduction to his revised edition of Wyatt's *Bēowulf*, published in 1914.¹ No work of such scope has yet appeared upon that fine old Epic. Dr. Chambers' volume surveys the field of our present knowledge and adds much that is new. His studies of the stories of Offa and Finn are of special value in this respect, and his work may be said to form a landmark in the history of research on *Bēowulf*.

In the first of the four parts into which the book is divided, Dr. Chambers deals with the evidence afforded by Latin and Scandinavian documents for the historical element in the story and examines their value. In Part II he gives the documents themselves. From this it becomes clear that there can no longer be any doubt of the historical origin of nearly all the chief personages introduced, however much their characters may have been modified in transition, and that it is therefore to the less essential figures, such as those of Offa and Finn, that the critic is now free to turn his attention.

After his survey of the historical element in the poem Dr. Chambers passes on to give and discuss the views held by different scholars on that which is not historical, and then to consider the other general questions which have been raised in connexion with *Bēowulf*, the Scandinavian or English origin of the poem, its language, metre, and structure, and the position to be assigned to the Christian element in it. The Scandinavian stories (with translations added) which go back to the same widely-spread folk-tale as that of Grendel and the Hag, are given in Part II.

¹ *Bēowulf: an Introduction*, by R. W. Chambers. Cambridge University Press. xii+417 pp. 30s.

Dr. Chambers himself is inclined to ascribe the figure of the hero *Bēowulf* entirely to the folk-tale element, or to allow it only the slightest of historical backgrounds. He points out that, not only is his name, which is very rare at any time, nowhere mentioned in any historical or semi-historical document, but that it does not alliterate with those of the royal family of the *Gēats*, to which he is represented as belonging, and that the whole episode, apart from the superhuman element, is inherently improbable. It is not likely that the *Gēat* kingdom would have suddenly lost its independence after the long and prosperous rule of a great king; that loss is far more likely to have been the result of the overthrow of his incapable predecessor, *Heardrēd*. Dr. Chambers accepts Panzer's identification of the folk-tale to which *Bēowulf* and its Scandinavian parallels go back, with that of the 'Bear's Son', which is found scattered over Europe and Asia; and later in Part IV he discusses that story in greater detail.

To folk-tale also Dr. Chambers ascribes the figure of *Thrytho*, the wicked queen of *Offa*, though he connects it with a different story from that suggested by Miss Rickert in *The Old English Offa-Saga*. The general association of the wife of *Offa* the Second with the historical *Cynethryth* of the Saxon Chronicle, cannot, he thinks, be accepted. If the *Offa* episode belongs to the original poem, as language and metre would prove, the relative dates make it impossible, and moreover the character of *Thrytho* as represented in the Chronicle bears no resemblance to that of the virago of *Bēowulf*. The account of her in the *Vitae Duorum Offarum* is probably a later modification with a definite purpose.

In connexion with this subject must be mentioned the reproductions of the five clever illustrations of the story of *Offa* in the MS. of the above-mentioned *Vitae* (MS. Cotton Nero D. I), in the British Museum, which are here made generally accessible for the first time, and add very greatly to the attractions of this valuable study.

Another point in which Dr. Chambers differs from the now general view is in his interpretation of the term '*Scyld Scēfing*'. He considers that the historian William of Malmesbury must here be looked on as the sounder authority than the old poem, and that his version, '*Scyld son of Scēaf*', must be the right one, *Scēaf* being originally a culture god, emblematic of harvest. This

view he illustrates by interesting descriptions of the honour paid to the sheaf in various countries and at different times.

Part III is occupied by a detailed study of the story of Finn as told in *Beowulf* and the *Finnsburg* Fragment, and an interpretation of that difficult episode in the light of what is known of early Germanic laws and customs. Whether one agrees with all Dr. Chambers' conclusions or not, this chapter is one of great interest and value. Part IV consists of a series of studies on points of detail which, in some cases, go further into subjects already discussed. The volume ends with a full Bibliography and an Index.

Besides the series of illustrations from the life of Offa, already mentioned, other interesting illustrations are a plan of Leire in the seventeenth century, reproductions of two Viking ships, a map of Southern Scandinavia in the sixth century, and examples of an Old English helmet with its boar crest, and of two Ring-swords.

From this study of the sources and composition of our great national epic we pass on to the translation of the poem itself by Captain Scott-Moncrieff.²

This, which has been preceded by a translation of the Song of Roland by the same author, is a bold attempt to reproduce in Modern English the Old English poems *Widsith*, *Beowulf*, *Finnsburg*, *Waldere*, and *Dēor*, keeping, as far as possible, the old vocabulary and metre. Short arguments of the poems precede the translations, and notes follow, explanatory of meanings or allusions, for some of which the author acknowledges indebtedness to Dr. Chambers' *Widsith, a Study of OE. Heroic Legend*. These notes will be found helpful for interpretation and suggestive for appreciation. To render verse of one language into verse of another is always difficult, but when the original belongs to a date at which thought, mode of expression, and structure of the language were at a very different stage from that of the present day, the difficulty is increased a hundredfold. It is almost impossible to give a sustained impression of the rhythm of the line throughout a poem of the length and character of *Beowulf*, without at times forcing the translation and thus falsifying the mode of expression

² *Beowulf*. Translated by C. K. Scott-Moncrieff, with an Introduction by Viscount Northcliffe. Chapman & Hall. xxvi + 127. 7s. 6d. net.

or the thought. Captain Scott-Moncrieff is therefore seen at his best in the shorter poems or in certain passages of *Beowulf*. He has succeeded in keeping one essential characteristic of Old English poetic diction, the use of the compound word, such as 'swan-road' for the sea; 'foamy-necked floater' for a ship; 'battle-gleamer' for the sword, and others, which require to be taken in their context to be appreciated. He has also succeeded in conveying much of the vigour and movement of the story, and many of his lines are very happily rendered. In others, the almost insuperable difficulty, already spoken of, in translating a phrase from an inflected into an uninflected language has hampered him. Still, whatever criticism may be made, this translation is to be welcomed as an attempt to stimulate interest in our older literature, by thus bringing it within the reach of a wider public. *It should be successful in this.

The next work to be considered leads us into an entirely different sphere of Anglo-Saxon study. Professor Max Foerster's very able article, *Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen*,³ was contributed to the *Texte und Forschungen zur Englischen Kulturgeschichte: Festgabe für Felix Liebermann*. In it the author restricts himself for want of space to the Keltic element introduced into Old English. He begins by emphasizing the necessity (too often overlooked, he thinks) of distinguishing two series of borrowings, the earlier and larger set of words borrowed by the Angles and Saxons from the conquered Britons, and a second smaller set learnt from the Irish missionaries. While the first set have to do with the affairs of everyday life and the Keltic skill in metal-work, and consist largely of the names of animals and tools, the second are learned borrowings connected chiefly with the monastic life, and consisting of theological terms and the like. This distinction is well illustrated later, when the author goes on to examine in detail the chief words of each class. Professor Foerster considers that these two divisions are adequate since the words, though not recorded till later, must have been borrowed between the fifth and seventh centuries. At that time, though important linguistic changes were going on, dialectal distinctions between the forms of the language spoken by the Kelts of Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany were so slight that the

³ *Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen. Eine sprachliche Untersuchung*, von Max Foerster. Halle (Saale). Max Niemeyer. 128 pp.

common original can be reconstructed, and for this he uses the term 'Old-British' as distinct from the earlier and wider term 'Primitive Keltic'.

Modern criticism has considerably diminished the number of words in Old English which used to be assigned to a Keltic origin. Professor Foerster would cut the list still shorter. For example, he connects *cradol* with the Old High German 'chratto, chrezzo', a basket, rather than with a Keltic root to rock. The cradles of those days were not, as far as may be gathered from the one representation preserved, made to be rocked! Other words whose Keltic origin he doubts are *denu*, a valley; *denn*, a den; and *dūn*, a down, for which neither form nor meaning, he thinks, justifies a connexion with the Keltic *dūn*, a fortified place. *Gafol*, tribute, cannot be Keltic, but must be from the stem of the verb to give.

Professor Foerster passes on to show that the same distinction between those of British and those of Irish origin, must also be made in the case of proper names. This is clearly to be seen in the names in the *Liber Vitae Dunelmensis*. He divides up proper names into large classes of (a) early family names, such as *Howel*; (b) patronymics, such as *Ap Howel*, the modern Powell; and (c) names of local origin, such as *Cair Riu*, the castle of the mill, the modern Carew, and smaller classes of those names taken from some personal characteristic, such as *Coch*, red, the modern Gough, and yet more rarely from occupation.

Finally comes a short chapter on Place-Names. Very noticeable among Professor Foerster's examples of the many modern names of Keltic origin is the large number of those beginning with Cad-, Chad-, Cat-, Chat-, such as Cadman, Chadwick, Cadogan, Catton, Chatsworth, or with the abbreviated patronymic p-, b-, such as Price, Prichard, Parry, Barry, Bevan.

A work of considerable scope which has appeared this year is *Die Mythologischen Ausdrücke im altenglischen Wortschatz*,⁴ by Herr Richard Jente, Instructor in German in the University of Minnesota. In this work the author has put together the evidence afforded by the Old English vocabulary concerning the native beliefs.

⁴ *Die Mythologischen Ausdrücke im altenglischen Wortschatz. Eine kultur-geschichtlich-etymologische Untersuchung*, von Richard Jente. Anglistische Forschungen. Heft 56. xx+344 pp. Mk. 26.40. •

and religious customs of the Anglo-Saxons. For this purpose he considers words as they occur in compounds or independently, including those such as *Frige* found only in the compounds *Frigedæg*, &c. He also makes much use of personal and place-names. Additional value is given by the short discussion of the etymology of each word in order to bring out the general conceptions behind the definite terms. Thus the original meanings of the words for 'god', 'soul', 'spirit', and of many others are discussed.

Herr Jente deals first with the external aspects of worship, with the information to be gained as to the functions of the priesthood, the nature of the temples, and with the question of the use of idols. He comes to the conclusion that at the time of their conversion to Christianity the Anglo-Saxons had a regular hierarchy of priests and temples built of wood, in which were placed idols, and that their formal worship must have consisted of song, dance, and sacrifice, since all these things are mentioned to be forbidden in later Christian laws. From these considerations he passes on to that of the gods and goddesses who can be proved to have been thus worshipped. A very interesting chapter follows next, dealing with the conception of the supernatural as shown in the belief in the soul, in a future life, and in good and bad spirits of all kinds. Herr Jente assumes that besides the higher forms of worship mentioned above, the older, more primitive forms originally held round some natural object, such as a tree or stone, or in a grove, long survived, and may be traced in later superstitions. He thinks, for instance, that the early belief, that the soul passed at death into the wind, is the source of the story told in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle of the ghostly hunting parties heard by the monks and others between Peterborough and Stamford in the spring of the year 1127, and represents the 'Wilde Jagd' of German legend. Further chapters of great interest are those treating of the Anglo-Saxon attitude towards fate and death, and with their practice of magic.

It is obvious that the subject-matter of the various chapters must to some extent overlap, and that there must be a certain amount of repetition in the book, but Herr Jente has collected much useful material in dealing with his obscure and difficult subject.

In *Das Problem des Flexionsschwundes im ags.*⁵ Herr Hübener gives us a contribution to the history of English syntax. The author here follows up his earlier article, 'Zur Erklärung der Wortstellungsentwicklung im ags'. His object is to prove that the loss of inflexions in English is the *result* of the gradual fixing of the word-order, and not as usually explained, the *cause*, and that the general introduction of prepositions and conjunctions followed. The writer therefore rejects earlier theories, such as that of Jespersen, that the loss of inflexion was due to the introduction of the foreign element into the language, showing that this loss had begun before any great number of French or Scandinavian words are found. Here he overlooks the fact that Scandinavian words must have been in the spoken language long before they appear in literature, and that they would have been borrowed in the very district in which inflexions first began to fall, i. e. in the North.

Herr Hübener also rejects the commonly-given explanation that the loss of inflexions was the inevitable result of the Germanic Accent Law, or that it was due to the greater use of prepositions and conjunctions. He points out that though such linkwords were undoubtedly used in Old English, it was only with restricted meanings; they are not found in general use till the Middle English period. He works out his own theory by tracing the development of word-order from early OE. texts, such as *Genesis* 'A' and *Beowulf*, through the works of Aelfred and the later entries in the Peterborough Chronicle down to the *Sawles Warde* and the *Ancren Riwle*. He shows by means of many statistics that the position of the verb was gradually changing during the whole of that time. It was getting moved back more and more frequently from its position at the end of the sentence to one nearer the subject. In the writings of Aelfred, even in principal sentences, it is found almost as often immediately after the subject as at the end of the sentence; in dependent sentences the end position is yet rarer. But inflexions are still intact. Hence the loss of inflexion did not precede fixed word-order. Later, as the end position of the verb became rarer, less importance was attached to inflexions and they were dropped. In a language in which the thought is not

⁵ *Das Problem des Flexionsschwundes im ags.* Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur. Bd. 45. Heft 1, p. 85. 17 pp.

completely expressed till the end of the sentence brings the verb (gespannte Wortstellung), inflexion is important and therefore retained, but in a language in which the principal parts of a sentence may come earlier (lose Wortstellung) inflexion is neglected, and it is to this psychological factor that the loss of inflexion in English is due.

Lastly, Old English texts themselves are represented by Mr. Crawford's scholarly edition of the *Exameron Anglice*.⁶

The first part of the work is an Introduction, in which the editor begins with a description of the various MSS. which exist of the *Exameron*, their dates, phonological, orthographical, and grammatical features, and the relationship between them. He then goes on to examine the evidence for Aelfric's authorship, which he considers fully proved by similarity with his other works in vocabulary, syntax, style (it is in the same metrical prose as some of his sermons), method of using his sources, and lastly by his references to his other writings.

Mr. Crawford next considers the sources used; and decides that the *Hexameron* of St. Basil may have been one, but that the English version can in no sense be called a translation of that of St. Basil.

Part II contains the text itself with a translation; variants are given, and the theory of Aelfric's authorship is illustrated by the addition of parallel passages from his acknowledged works.

⁶ *Exameron Anglice or the Old English Hexameron*. Ed. by S. J. Crawford, M.A., B.Litt., Professor of English Philology in the Madras Christian College. Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa. X. Band. Hamburg. Henri Grand, 1921. 85 pp. 30 Mks.

IV

MIDDLE ENGLISH

[By MARGARET L. LEE]

Two general observations may be made in regard to the year's work of this section ; first, that in the majority of cases the purpose of the modern author or editor has been literary, social, or historical rather than linguistic ; secondly, that an unusually large proportion of the books considered deal with matter belonging to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Mr. Sisam's volume of extracts from fourteenth-century writers¹ forbids any narrow definition of the nature of its appeal. In it we seem to possess what has so long been lacking to the student of late Middle English—an altogether excellent collection of representative pieces.

Anthologies culled from Old and Middle English literature have hitherto tended to emphasize the philological value of the passages chosen, at the expense of literary interest (Professor Cook's *Literary Middle English Reader* (1915) is a noteworthy exception, but has little in the way of textual annotation.) Mr. Sisam's collection, on the contrary, is so edited as to appeal both to linguistic and literary scholarship, and this in itself implies a high level of attainment. The Introduction, a delightful piece of critical prose, deals with the growth of romance and of new metrical forms during the thirteenth century, thus leading on to a detailed study of the fourteenth century, with its alliterative revival on the one hand, its fresh tide of foreign influence on the other, and its development of a new literary type, the Miracle Play. The discussion of the Middle English didactic or moral poem leads to an interesting digression, meant to prove that the large

¹ *Fourteenth-Century Verse and Prose*, ed. by K. Sisam. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1921. xxxiii + 264 + App. 27 pp. 7s. 6d. net. •

proportion of such poems among existing MSS. is inconclusive, since 'up to Chaucer's day, the greater the popularity of an English poem, the less important becomes the MS. as a means of early transmission. To determine the relative popularity of the longer tales in verse we need, not so much a catalogue of extant MSS. as a census, that cannot now be taken, of the repertoires of the entertainers.'

In a concluding section Mr. Sisam provides some hints on the study of early literature which should be of real benefit to students. The need for intensive *plus* discursive reading, and of a 'sensitive' attitude towards the writings dealt with, has seldom been so much as referred to in the ordinary text-book, which is apt to assume a finished scholarship on the part of the untrained student. Mr. Sisam writes as a teacher no less than a man of letters, and his point of view is broadly humanistic.

The scheme of the book excludes selections from Chaucer, 'who suffers when read in extracts . . . although without him fourteenth-century literature is a body without a head'. The point is debatable; but if it be conceded, the choice of pieces leaves little room for criticism. Robert Mannyng, Richard Rolle, Langland, Man-deville, Barbour, Wiclif, Gower, Trevisa, and Minot are the chief individual authors represented, and there are plentiful extracts from the anonymous West Midland alliterative poems, the lyrics, and the York and Towneley plays. Each extract is introduced by a few clear paragraphs of general information, and elucidated by several pages of notes which fulfil the double function of exciting interest in subject-matter and in form. The volume includes an Appendix of nearly thirty pages on the English Language in the fourteenth century, so compact and suggestive as to constitute an altogether admirable introduction to the study of Middle English from the linguistic point of view; and (in the later edition) a Vocabulary, which is also issued separately for purchasers of the book in its earlier form.² It is unfortunate that this separate issue is unpagged, and that it should be entitled a Vocabulary on the cover and a Glossary within. But these small points do not obscure the fact that Mr. Tolkien has worthily completed a piece of work which can hardly be praised too highly by teachers whom experience has

² *A Middle English Vocabulary*, by J. R. R. Tolkien. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922. (Not pagged). 4s. 6d. net.

brought to realize the underlying unity of all literary and linguistic study worthy of the name.

Mr. Tolkien gives 'exceptionally full treatment to what may rightly be called the backbone of the language', e.g. he devotes much space and care to the various meanings of the preposition *to*, and the various forms of the pronoun *he*, or the verb *habben*, rather than to suggested etymologies of the rare and obscure words contained in his texts. The result is a Vocabulary with exhaustive textual references, having a value independent of the extracts to which it is appended—comparable indeed in fullness and interest with Heyne's Glossary to *Bēowulf* and a few others like it. The treatment of convertible symbols such as *ȝ* and *g*, *þ* and *th*, *u* and *v*, *i* and *y*, is particularly to be commended.

We hope that future editions of *Fourteenth-Century Verse and Prose* will be printed on more opaque paper, on which students could insert their own marginal annotations in ink.

It is doubtful whether a thoroughly good collection of pieces such as the one just considered, or a finely-edited example of the best that a Middle-English writer could produce, forms the more desirable introduction to a study of the period. Of the latter class of work we have a specimen in Sir I. Gollancz's *Pearl*,³ a labour of love summarizing the fruit of many years' patient investigation.

The editor regards 'this early *In Memoriam*' as based undoubtedly upon a personal experience, its scheme 'elaborated from the one thought of the transfiguration of the child'.

Uniting as it does the influences of Scripture and of Romance, of the courtly and the native poetic schools, its artistic value is unique, and so is its significance for the future development of English poetry. Many points of interest are touched upon in the Introduction to the text: the approximation of two sister arts, shown alike in the 'brilliancy of colour and richness of description' of the poem itself, and in the illustrations, here reproduced, which adorn the fourteenth-century MS.; the possible connexion with Boccaccio's *Olympia*, a similar lament for a young daughter; the

³ *Pearl*, edited, with modern Rendering, Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, together with Boccaccio's *Olympia*, by Sir I. Gollancz, Litt.D., F.B.A. London, Chatto & Windus, 1921. xliv+285 pp. 7s. 6d. net.

vexed problem of authorship; and the relation of *Pearl* to the other three important poems of the West Midland group.

The notes supplied by Professor Gollancz are no less interesting to the general reader than helpful to the serious student. There is also an adequate glossary, greatly improving upon that of a previous edition; and the Appendix, introducing and translating Boccaccio's eclogue, gives the book a special value for those who find in parallel expressions of fundamental human feeling a convincing proof of the brotherhood of man.

A treatment of Sir Thomas Malory's great book is presented by Miss V. Scudder⁴ as the outcome of fifteen years' study with college classes. Admirable work has been done on the subject long since by Dr. Oskar Sommer, whose elaborate tables have been used by Miss Scudder as a basis for her own discussion. But Sommer's scholarship is of the strictly analytic and emendatory type which appeals only to the like-minded, whereas Miss Scudder has aimed at a popular presentation suited to the less erudite reader.

The arrangement of the book is business-like. Part I deals with Malory's predecessors—early Arthurian romance in Britain, French verse and prose romances, the development of the Merlin and Lancelot stories, and the romances of the Middle English period. In Part II we have, first, a study of Malory the man, and then a detailed analysis of his great work, the sources of which, together with certain aspects of Malory as philosopher and artist, are discussed in Part III.

The spirit in which Miss Scudder approaches her subject may be gathered from certain passages in the chapter entitled *Preliminaries*:

The most fascinating work is the investigation of sources. It leads back and back, till behind Geoffrey's Arthur fighting the giant of Mont S. Michel rise all mythic heroes who have slain monsters of darkness, and the traits of Morgan le Fay are explained by her kinship to the Valkyrie, or the Irish war-goddess, the Morrighu. It is in Keltic myth and legend that the

⁴ *Le Morte d'Arthur of Sir Thomas Malory*, by Vida D. Scudder. London & Toronto: Dent & Sons, 1921. iv+407 pp., with Bibliography, 7 pp. 10s. 6d. net.

richest suggestions are found; yet the mind is impelled to peer toward yet farther horizons; Guenevere borne away by Meliagrance may be own cousin to Persephone in the courts of Hades; Gawain, waxing in strength as the sun mounts the sky, certainly suggests the large family of sun-heroes; and Perceval, dumb and puzzled as the Grail passes before the bier of a king dying yet never dead, may assist at the mystic burial rites of an Eastern god of vegetation.

Malory, as Miss Scudder points out in dealing with the Tristram story, is at times disappointing by reason of his prolixity, his omissions, his repetitions, and his general tendency to dilute and weaken the finest of the old legends. But taken as a whole 'the *Morte d'Arthur* is unique, not so much in its type as in its genius'; and 'the final quality of Malory's art lies deeper than cadence or dramatic narrative; it is his power of suggestion'. Chapter V of Part III deals with this 'suggestion' under the name of 'causality' (the determinism of the modern psychologist), and points to it as 'the hall-mark of romance at its conclusion rather than its inception'.

Finally, Miss Scudder assigns to Malory—excelled as he is at various points by Chaucer, Langland, and the unknown author of the West Midland alliterative poems—the credit of having written 'the most important single book produced in England during the Middle Ages'. 'No other book', she concludes, 'so carries the weight and force of a whole epoch, crystallized in the alembic of the imagination, and emerging in its immortal part alone.'

This contribution to Arthurian exegetic literature has value, but we could wish that it were less explanatory and more suggestive. Many of the descriptive, paraphrastic, and eulogistic passages might well be omitted without detriment to the main theme. Even a young reader prefers to draw his own conclusions in matters of aesthetics.

Study of the Arthurian story may well lead on by a natural transition to the subject of an article by Professor I. Gollancz on *The Middle Ages in the Lineage of English Poetry*.⁵ This article forms one chapter of a valuable work in which ten contributors

⁵ *Mediaeval Contributions to Modern Civilization*, ed. by F. J. C. Hearnshaw, M.A., LL.D. London: Harrap, 1921. 262 pp. 10s. 6d.

have devoted themselves to the exposition of the debt which modern civilization owes to the Middle Ages.

Tracing the mediaeval element in fourteenth-century literature, the writer distinguishes 'two schools, the Chaucerian and the West Midland, representing two great voices in the harmonies of English poetry', the one mainly artistic, the other mainly moral and didactic. In the poet of the *Pearl* these two are blended, and it is for this reason that 'he, in a sense more truly than Chaucer, is the herald of the Elizabethan poets'. Spenser is his literary descendant, in whom the mediaeval spirit finds its fullest expression in Elizabethan times. That same spirit rescued the drama from subservience to classical rules, and helped it to unite the freedom of the Old Teutonic alliterative metre with the form of academic blank verse. Later and more consciously, the influence of mediaevalism is wooed by the poets of the Romantic Revival—in the pioneer work of Percy, Macpherson, Ossian, Gray, and Chatterton, and in the maturer romantic poetry of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Tennyson, and above all Morris, the most thoroughly mediaeval of modern English poets.

Last among this year's critical writings stands a welcome new edition, revised, reset, and freshly illustrated, of that compendium of good things, Jusserand's *English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages*.⁶ It seems hardly necessary to describe a work of which ten impressions have been exhausted since its first appearance as a translation in 1889. The life of the open road was (and has remained until its recent lamentable obscuration by heavy motor traffic) one with the life of the English country-side, and in the fourteenth century it might serve as an introduction to members of every order of society, secular and religious, from the juggler, the pedlar, and the outlaw to the pilgrim of high or of low rank in the social and ecclesiastical hierarchy.

This theme is developed by M. Jusserand, and great value is added to his exposition by the sixty-eight excellent illustrations providing visual proof of the rich and varied circumstance of mediaeval life in the fourteenth century. These, probably, give rise

⁶ *English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages* (14th century), by J. J. Jusserand, translated from the French by L. Toulmin Smith. London: Fisher Unwin. New ed. 1920. 416 pp. + App. 22 pp. 25s. net.

to the one regrettable feature of the book; it weighs close upon 3 lb., and is consequently unpleasant to handle.

We now turn to books presenting more of the raw material of scholarship. A surprising amount of such work stands to the credit of the Early English Text Society. This is partly due to difficulty of production during and immediately after the War, which has delayed till 1920-2 the appearance of several volumes intended for issue at a much earlier date.

It is pleasant to take up a new volume bearing the honoured name of Dr. Furnivall. This small book, entitled *The Gild of St. Mary, Lichfield*⁷ contains some Gild Ordinances of Richard II and of Sir Humfrey Stanley, Dean Heywood's Reform of *Our Lady's Alms-Chest*, the first and second extant Charters of the Lichfield Tailors and Smiths, and a few other fragments. The editorial matter is very slight, but we recognize the personal touch of our old friend in the marginal summaries, and in the relegation to oblivion of another Ordinance—'It has twenty-three clauses founded almost wholly on the foregoing Ordinances. I don't think it worth printing.' The Ordinances chosen for reproduction have appeared before in Harwood's *History of Lichfield*, 1807; but have here been made more accessible. They are first-rate specimens of their type.

The English writings of the Bishop and Cardinal John Fisher were issued by the Early English Text Society under the editorship of Professor Mayor in 1876. To these Mr. Bayne added shortly before his death a transcript of the MS. *Life of Fisher* in the British Museum ascribed to Richard Hall.⁸

The *Life* contains a variety of information, relating, not merely to Fisher himself, but to such topics as the founding of St. John's College, Cambridge, Fisher's relations with Luther and Wolsey, the marriage of Catharine of Aragon, the death of Henry VII. and the matrimonial and ecclesiastical affairs of Henry VIII.

⁷ *The Gild of St. Mary, Lichfield*, ed. by the late Dr. F. J. Furnivall. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, for E.E.T.S. 1920. 82 pp. 15s. net.

⁸ *The Life of Fisher*, transcribed from MS. Harleian 6382 by the Rev Ronald Bayne, M.A. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press for E.E.T.S. 1921. 140 pp. 15s. net.

Finally, it is told how Fisher, refusing to subscribe by oath to the establishment of the King's succession, was sent to the Tower at the same time as Sir Thomas Moore. The gift of a Cardinal's hat from the Pope did not avert his fate, Henry's comment being—'Let the Pope send him a hatt when he will, but I will so provide that when soever it commeth he shall weare it on his shoulders, for head shall he have none to sett it on'. Upon the evidence of Rich, Fisher was condemned to be hanged, drawn, and quartered; and the weak and sickly old man died with the high courage of a Socrates, his martyrdom increasing the odium already incurred by the miserable King, and Ann Bullen, 'cheef persecutor of this holy man'.

Save for some final pages of moralizing, the *Life* is written with a vividness and sympathy which hold the reader's attention throughout. It is interesting to observe traces of the dawning fashion of euphuism in the repetitional or punning tendency of some of the sentences, e.g. [By this] (the 'fresh and lively' colour in Fisher's cheeks after decapitation) 'was notified to the worlde the innocencie and holines of this blessed father, that thus innocently was contented to loose his head in defence of his mothers heade, the holy Catholick Church of Christ'.

A certain amount of biographical material exists concerning the early fifteenth-century bishop of St. Asaph, Reginald Pecock, of whom Edward IV wrote to the Pope as 'a monstrous promoter of iniquity and perdition'. Of his six surviving works, however, little is generally known, and the *Donet*, of which like the rest only one copy is extant, has not previously been edited. Miss Hitchcock's treatment of the unique Bodleian MS.⁹ is thorough and conscientious in a high degree. The moral treatise itself differs little in general tone and structure from many other examples of its type, save that it contains some evidence of more independent thought and a wider culture. But its relation to Pecock's better-known *Poore Mennis Myrrour*, and the place of both in his carefully mapped-out philosophy of religion (a philosophy which exalts reason as 'the largist book of autorite that euer god made') are of some interest. To Pecock, as the editor

⁹ *The Donet*, by Reginald Pecock, D.D., ed. by Elsie V. Hitchcock, B.A. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, for E.E.T.S., 1921. xxii + 270 pp. 35s. net.

observes, 'religion is a logical necessity, reason is a religious necessity'. He anticipates the Age of Reason, while at the same time perpetuating the mediaeval fusion of philosophy with theology, to the detriment of both.

Pecock's dialect is mainly East Midland, but with characteristics distinguishing it from the contemporary London speech.

Another early fifteenth-century MS. is that which through the care of Professor Gollancz and the industry of Miss Day has been secured for the British Museum, and happily named the Wheatley MS.,¹⁰ in memory of Dr. Wheatley, who served the Early English Text Society as Honorary Secretary and as Treasurer till his death in 1917. The contents of this MS. are exceedingly varied; it is in fact an anthology, containing some items hitherto unknown, notably *An Orison on the Passion*, *A Prayer to the Blessed Virgin*, and *A Hymn to St. John the Baptist*. The pieces are in different dialects, among which the East Midland preponderates. Miss Day has supplied a good Preface (which would be better named an Introduction), Notes, and Glossary—the two latter commendably brief and business-like.

Notes and articles dealing with Middle English philology are this year somewhat numerous. Good textual notes and an exceptionally full glossary to the dialogue entitled *Vices and Virtues*,¹¹ dating from about 1200, have been written by Dr. F. Holthausen. *Englische Studien* for 1921¹² contains a short but suggestive article by O. Funke, *Zur Wortgeschichte der französischen Elemente im Englischen*, with lists of French words found in certain twelfth- and thirteenth-century writings.

In an interesting article on *Grammatical and Natural Gender in Middle English*¹³ Mr. Moore discusses the substitution of the

¹⁰ *The Wheatley Manuscript*, ed. from Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 39574, by Mabel Day, Litt.D. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, for E.E.T.S., 1921. 30s. net.

¹¹ *Vices and Virtues*, ed. by Ferd. Holthausen, Ph.D. Part II: Notes and Glossary. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, for E.E.T.S., 1921. 116 pp. 12s. net.

¹² *Englische Studien*, 55. Band, 1. Heft. Leipzig, 1921.

¹³ *Grammatical and Natural Gender in Middle English*, by Samuel Moore. (Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, xxxvi, no. 1, March 1921.)

latter for the former during the ME. period. Most scholars agree that loss of grammatical gender was due to the disappearance of the gender-distinguishing forms of the strong adjective, the definite article, and the demonstrative and other pronouns. But they have hitherto failed to correlate with this the further fact of the retention of such forms in the personal pronouns. Mr. Moore's argument is that natural gender 'came in by way of the personal pronouns', in which grammatical and natural gender very seldom conflicted; and this he develops with much care and skill, illustrating his thesis by means of numerous examples.

Anglia for January 1921 contains¹⁴ an instalment of Georg Dubislav's interesting detached notes on points of Middle English syntax. Probably the most noteworthy contribution to language study in a recent periodical is Mr. Lindkvist's fifty-page article (virtually a treatise) in the same number, on the origin of the pronoun *she*.¹⁵ Step by step Mr. Lindkvist demonstrates the weakness of hitherto accepted or suggested theories; and having demolished their claim, he proceeds to build up carefully and skilfully a new explanation, i. e. that the Old Northumbrian *hio* developed into *hjo*, *jo*, in the first of which the *j* became consonantal and very slightly sounded. This form, by false division with the third person singular present indicative of verbs in phrases like *hæfes hio*, *wæs hio*, became *shjo*, *scho*; and another blend of *scho* with *he* or *ze*, taking place in the N. E. M. dialect, produced *sche* and *she*, which occur first in the *Peterborough Chronicle* of 1140 A. D. The chief difficulty in establishing this theory arises from the scantiness of Northern material in the Early ME. period. Mr. Lindkvist frankly admits the gaps in his evidence, and thereby predisposes us all the more to accept a hypothesis which appears eminently sound and rational.

The year's *Modern Philology* contains several noteworthy articles. Mr. Bryan¹⁶ disputes the usually accepted explanation of the Pres. Indic. suffix *e(n)*, which he calls 'the most marked single characteristic of the Midland dialect', as due to analogy with the

¹⁴ *Studien zur mitttelenglischen Syntax*, III, Georg Dubislav.

¹⁵ *On the Origin and History of the English Pronoun She*, Harald Lindkvist. (*Anglia*, Band xlv, Erstes Heft.)

¹⁶ *The Midland Present Plural Indicative ending e(n)*, by W. F. Bryan. (*Modern Philology*, xviii, no. 9, January 1921.)

Plural Present Subjunctive, reinforced perhaps by the Plural Preterite Subjunctive and Indicative. His theory is that this ending, which in the E. M. dialect has supplanted *þ* by the middle of the twelfth century, owes its origin rather to the influence of the preterite present verbs, and of some forms of the substantive verb, viz. *sindon*, *earon*, *bipon*. Analogical levelling occurs only where close points of contact, either formal or functional, exist; and functional contacts are closest between the Plural Present Indicative of normal verbs, and the corresponding parts of the preterite presents and the substantive verb. Evidence proves cross-levelling between the two endings (*þ* and *n*) at an early stage, after which the strong influence of the most primitive verb-forms in the language seems to prevail. Mr. Bryan admits and discusses some opposing tendencies in dialects other than the Midland.

Another new suggestion emanates from Mr. Hulbert, who writes on *The 'West Midland' of the Romances*.¹⁷ He calls attention to the slight basis of evidence upon which the ascription of *Sir Gawayn* and the other poems of its MS. and group to the W. M. district actually rests. Morris, the first editor of *Sir Gawayn*, drew his conclusions entirely from the verb-inflections and the use of the genitive *hit*, both doubtful and possibly fallacious as evidence. Other critics have accepted these conclusions. Even Dr. Jordan's and Professor Wyld's researches fail to provide any convincing linguistic proof that the poems were written in the West; and the evidence of metre and subject-matter seems, when investigated, to be equally inconclusive.

Mr. Hulbert does not attempt to force any opposite theory upon his readers, being strongly of opinion that the exact localization of ME. documents, on linguistic grounds at least, is an impossibility. He takes his stand on the fact that the mixture of Northern inflections and Midland phonology which characterizes these poems occurs 'all along the border between the N. and M. districts', as e.g. in the Norfolk Guild returns, the Towneley Plays, *Havelok*, and the work of Robert Mannyng—the resemblances between texts so diverse having regard, of course, to certain broader features only. Thus 'until some evidence which does connect with the West is produced, we are justified only in saying

¹⁷ *The 'West Midland' of the Romances*, by J. R. Hulbert. (*Modern Philology*, xix, no. 1, Aug. 1921.)

that these (i. e. *Sir Gawayn* and the other members of the group) are North Midland documents.'

Perhaps the most important outcome of this theory is the fact that it would render nugatory the usual assumption that the fourteenth-century revival of alliterative metre took place in the West. Mr. Hulbert points out that 'of the alliterative poetry which is localized (e. g. the York Plays, and the work of Rolle) most is Northern' and quotes in support of this the words of Chaucer's Parson—

'I am a southren man,
I kan not geste rum, ram, ruf by lettre.'

Another contribution to the study of the same group of poems is made by Mr. O. F. Emerson in a paper¹⁸ intended 'to emphasize the relation of linguistic facts to the metrical irregularities of M.E. poetry, through application to two poems belonging to the same time and district'—i. e. *Pearl* and *Sir Gawayn*. Mr. Emerson's conclusion is to the effect that most, if not all, of the imperfect riming lines in these poems can be explained by the double pronunciation of many words with and without a final *e*, due, of course, to the transitional state of the language. Such double forms are rarer in these texts than in Chaucer, but are by no means unknown.

Mr. Steadman, writing on the date of *Winnere and Wastoure*,¹⁹ rearranges the evidence made use of by Sir Israel Gollancz in his edition of that poem, and adds to it further facts which serve to confirm the acceptance of the year 1352-3. 'If we assume any other date, the purpose, the allegory, the definite references to topics of the day, in short, the timeliness of the poem and its significance as a pamphlet of the hour, are at once considerably weakened, if not rendered quite meaningless.'

Last come a couple of articles dealing with literary matters. One²⁰ is an original and interesting analysis of the last twelve stanzas of Chaucer's *Troilus and Cressida*, which stand apart

¹⁸ *Imperfect Lines in 'Pearl' and the Rimed Parts of 'Sir Gawayn'*, by O. F. Emerson. (*Modern Philology*, xix, no. 2, Nov. 1921.)

¹⁹ *The Date of Winnere and Wastoure*, by J. M. Steadman. (*Modern Philology*, xix, no. 2 Nov. 1921.)

²⁰ *The Epilog of Chaucer's Troilus*, by John S. P. Tatlock. (*Modern Philology*, xviii, no. 12, Apr. 1921.)

from the rest of the poem, and are characterized by a curious mixture of grandeur with pathos, nobility with charm. Mr. Tatlock speaks in particular of two out of the five sections into which the Epilogue naturally falls, i.e. lines 1786-92 and 1835-59. He shows the antiquity of the 'Go, Little Book' conceit, considers the often-quoted dedication to Gower and Strode, and discusses in detail the exhortation to Youth in stanza 263 ('O yonge fresshe folkes') and the combat between Catholic and Classic-Renaissance tradition indicated in stanza 265. What seems remarkable is that 'the heartfelt worldly tale' should at the last be interpreted in an unworldly sense: Chaucer 'tells the story in one mood and ends in another'. What can be the reason for this change, and (especially) for the attack upon pagan learning in stanza 265?

In answering this question, Mr. Tatlock calls attention to the partial severance between the early Humanists and the Church, which brought even Petrarch and Boccaccio (sincere Catholics who, however, reconciled their faith with classical scholarship) under the suspicion of unorthodoxy. Chaucer wished to avoid such misunderstanding (cf. his attitude in the *Franklin's Tale* and the Retraction after the *Parson's Tale*) and so to a poem full of the colour and atmosphere of paganism he feels it necessary to add, even at some sacrifice of artistic effect, 'a makeshift unification of the work with everything else in his friends' minds and in his own'. He domesticates it, in fact, by 'ending on a familiar though discordant note'.

The same number of *Modern Philology* contains²¹ a section of an article on *The Grail and the English Sir Perceval*, usefully supplementing the researches of Miss Weston dealt with in the previous volume of *The Year's Work*.

²¹ *The Grail and the English Sir Perceval*, by A. C. L. Brown. (*Modern Philology*, xviii, no. 12, Apr. 1921.)

V

THE RENAISSANCE

[By ARTHUR W. REED]

MR. EINSTEIN'S study¹ of the political, social, and literary ideals of the sixteenth century will take a high place among the many contributions to learning and *belles lettres* that we owe on both sides of the Atlantic to distinguished members of the diplomatic service. To many students of Tudor literature it may well become the book to which they turn when they are at a loss to recapture the Tudor attitude to what we may call the questions of the day. Mr. Einstein's book is deceptive in its ease and singular lucidity; one has to turn to the notes to see the other side of the tapestry. Younger writers of academic dissertations might learn much from him of the literary art of digesting evidences and original material. A detailed appreciation of the work belongs rather to the field of social history than of literature and is not permissible here, but students of the literature of the sixteenth century will be well-advised to go to Mr. Einstein for guidance as to the material available for their inquiries and the use that may be made of it by the scholar who is a man of culture.

An important work in this section of *The Year's Work* appeared just in time to be very briefly noticed by Mr. Arundel Esdaile last year. Professor Berdan's *Early Tudor Poetry*² calls for a more extended appreciation than was possible then. In itself the poetry of the Early Tudors has small merit, nor does Mr. Berdan aim at winning converts for it. His enthusiasm is rather for the questions it raises, and there are many. There are the traditions to which in a degenerate way it conforms, its efforts to speak in a new manner and to handle new material; there are

¹ *Tudor Ideals*, by Lewis Einstein. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.; London: G. Bell & Sons, 1921. 14s. net.

² *Early Tudor Poetry, 1485-1547* (Studies in Tudor Literature), by John M. Berdan. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920. £1 6s. net.

the shadowy figures of Hawes and Barclay, the more definite but still obscure figure of Skelton, the still more definite but not very poetical John Heywood, and lastly there is the metrical confusion of most of its verse until there emerges *Tottel's Miscellany*. These and many other problems Mr. Berdan attacks in six elaborate and important essays.

His method has its faults. There is much repetition ; important problems are scattered disconnectedly through the book and are hard to gather together. On the supremely important question of versification Mr. Berdan has made it almost impossible for the reader to determine with accuracy all that his scattered passages actually indicate. A good index would have corrected this fault, but Mr. Berdan's index barely extends beyond names and titles ; key-words to subjects are missing.

Again, Mr. Berdan's title is a little misleading ; he deals with many subjects whose bearing on poetry may seem too remote. Probably half of his space is given to prose writers, educationists and humanists, Ascham, Elyot, Berners, More, and Vives. But Mr. Berdan brings originality to all his work, and leaves no subject that he touches where he found it. Few books of recent years have shown greater energy of investigation, and Mr. Berdan's gift of analytical shrewdness is likely to direct inquiries into fruitful channels when he has not himself done more than indicate a solution.

For the student of Stephen Hawes, Alexander Barclay, and particularly of John Skelton, his work has unusual value, and it is not easy to point to a single book in which a clearer and more acceptable analysis of their work and the influences and conditions that went to its making is to be found. His attempt to excite interest in John Heywood's *Spider and the Flie* would be justified if his key to the allegory were the right one, but in following the interpretation advanced by Haber in 1900, he has been misled. Wolsey was surely not the spider, and Haber does not identify the fly. In indicating the place of the allegory in the line of descent that passed through *Mother Hubbard's Tale* and *The Hind and the Panther* Mr. Berdan is on safer ground.

To the problems of Early Tudor versification Mr. Berdan has made an interesting contribution in his chapter on 'The Scholastic Tradition' by his ingenious study of Medieval Latin verse-forms

and theory of prosody. Particularly interesting is the light these forms and traditions throw on the practice of Skelton. On one of the main problems of Early Tudor poetry, Mr. Berdan, however, is not convincing. How arose the syllabic and iambic structure of so much of the verse in Tottel? He addresses himself to the development of blank verse with success, but to the more fundamental question he appears to devote little attention. Thus he does not make it clear whether by the *foot* Ascham means the syllable or the iambic group. John Frith, who was born in the same year as Wyatt, had clear views on this point, and in a controversial pamphlet in 1532 teases an opponent for his omission of a syllable—he calls it a foot—in some English verses. Frith was an Eton and King's College man, but he was also a Lutheran reformer, and it is to be regretted that Mr. Berdan has not dealt more fully with the metrical versions of the Psalms. Sternhold was a sound iambicist, and the popularity of the Psalms has its importance for metrical questions.

In the chapter on 'Humanism', which opens with a useful study of Alexander Barclay and closes with a somewhat depreciatory examination of Wyatt, too much space is allotted to More and the educational writers. Mr. Berdan seems to offer as a justification for this, an interesting speculation on Ascham as the theorist, and Grimald as the exponent, of a classicism which inspired or approved blank verse. To the question which he raises as to the priority of Grimald or Surrey as writers in blank verse, it is of small importance that he cannot supply an answer; Grimald wrote nothing that counts; but in his speculation that blank verse developed in England independently of Italian influence Mr. Berdan is not likely to win approval. It was called 'a straunge metre' and 'straunge' can only have one meaning. In dealing so fully with More and his circle it may be noted that no reference has been made to that admirable Chaucerian, Walter Smythe, More's personal servant, and afterwards Sword-Bearer to the Lord Mayor. Smythe's *Merry jests of the Widow Edith* throw unexpected light on the life of the household in Chelsea, and it is written in couplets of quaint irregularity, but obviously in imitation of Chaucer.

In his chapter on 'The Influence of Contemporary Literatures' Mr. Berdan lays stress on the slightness of our indebtedness to

Spain, Germany, and France, and in order to establish this negative result he makes considerable digressions, in which he deals with the Spanish *Celestine* and the English *Calisto and Melibæa*, with the printer Van Doesborgh and his assistant Laurence Andrewe, with *Til Eulenspiegel* and Andrewe's humorous translations, with Barclay and the authorship of *The Castle of Love* and with mock wills. He makes the interesting suggestion that Andrewe 'may have been the chief channel through which German literature entered England', but Andrewe was an unfortunate young printer and translator who fled the country about 1527, owing some £25 to an older printer. His work interests bibliographers but had little vogue. His importance for early Tudor poetry would have been perhaps better reflected in a foot-note. In his conclusion that our debt to France was small Mr. Berdan questions the deductions of Sir Sidney Lee, but in so doing raises perhaps more questions than he answers. It is notable in this connexion that Scottish poetry finds no place in *Early Tudor Poetry*.

Mr. Berdan appears to underrate Wyatt as a versifier. Is it not the case that Wyatt is in general syllabic, though not always, or even usually, iambic? Read in a deliberate, almost spondaic, way, Wyatt is an accurate metrist. Donne has often the same deliberate syllabic movement. Surrey is iambic; he develops upon Wyatt. The one recovered the syllabic law, the other found freedom of movement within it. Closely connected with the deliberate movement of his verse is the impression of strong lyrical sincerity in Wyatt's verse, a quality which Mr. Berdan seems also to undervalue.

In the last chapter, which is devoted to Surrey, Mr. Berdan, against the balance of his own evidence, appears to discount unnecessarily Surrey's regard for Wyatt. Surrey's praise is that of the disciple who surpasses his master in technical ease, but Surrey acknowledges his discipleship. He has, too, his own qualities, his own happiness in natural description for example. He has his own sincerity, an easier sincerity and less impressive than Wyatt's because of its easier fluency. In dealing with the *Virgil* of Douglas and of Surrey, the suggestion that phrases common to both may be due to commentaries accessible to both deserves the investigation that Mr. Berdan suggests. Miss Gladys

Willcock's work upon the Britwell text now appearing in the *Modern Language Review* may solve some of the problems that Mr. Berdan raises, but it is doubtful whether questions of date can be satisfactorily solved.

Mr. Berdan's future work will be looked for with interest, but one may not unkindly hope that he will confine his next book to a space less than 500 pages, for when he is not at grips with a problem he has a tendency to hold forth.

Mr. Taylor's *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century*³ was awaited with interest as the work of a writer who had won respect on both sides of the Atlantic by his earlier studies, *Ancient Ideals: A Study of Intellectual and Spiritual Growth from Early Times to the Establishment of Christianity*, and *The Mediaeval Mind*. He is engaged upon an extensive survey which calls for wide erudition and unusual staying power. Mr. Taylor has these qualifications, and we would add to them features that make all that he writes attractive, his strong common sense and admirably direct English. Hallam's *Introduction to the Literature of Europe* (1837) is now supplemented by Mr. Taylor's work in the same field, and they who know their Hallam best will best appreciate his successor's qualifications to survey the ground afresh.

The first volume of *Thought and Expression* deals with Italy, Germany, and France, and does not come within the scope of this survey.

In the second volume we would first draw attention to the remarkable closing chapter. It is a notable piece of writing, and as the days of great prefaces have passed we suggest that Mr. Taylor's readers should begin with his chapter on 'The Sixteenth-Century Forms of Expression'. The second volume has two sections, twelve chapters on England, and five on Philosophy and Science. Well-known ground is covered by the chapter on 'English Education in Letters', but Mr. Taylor has the gift of giving freshness to familiar things. The problem of justifying the persecution of heretics by the author of *Utopia* is left unsolved once more. May not More have been fighting for the Utopian

³ *Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century*, by Henry Osborne Taylor. (2 vols.) New York: The Macmillan Company. 50s. net.

vision of a Europe united under a liberal Catholicism? Visionaries are not seldom extremists.

With the 'English Reformation' Mr. Taylor deals in a series of studies on Wyclif and his successors, Lutheranism and Social Discontent, and finally Tyndale. In all this we find the 'catholic expression' of the temper and formative genius of the English people'. An admirable chapter on Hugh Latimer followed by an analysis of Puritan Doctrine leads up to Richard Hooker and the Anglican *via media*, a formula which appeals to the writer. 'A *via media* was the English people composite in race and language; a twisting *via media* was their great queen; a seemly *via media* was the Anglican Church.'

Some of Mr. Taylor's chapters are *tours de force*. Such are that last chapter already mentioned, and the equally vigorous essay on 'Elizabethans'. The study of Elizabeth and Cecil is a memorable piece of writing, incisive and convincing. Not less interesting is the freshness of the chapter on Spenser, a subject that yields full scope for Mr. Taylor's command of vivid and arresting comparative illustration.

As Italy expressed itself in painting so the Elizabethans found their self-expression in Drama. Yet as Mr. Taylor pertinently indicates, Elizabethan drama had its exclusions. Necessarily it was not religious; the necessity was political. Broadly speaking, it passed by the daily life of the people, the diggers and delvers, trade and commerce, the crafts and professions save the profession of arms. It is to Shakespeare inevitably that Mr. Taylor turns now. 'He is worth all the rest.' The man of the 'tender forgiveness' of the Sonnets, tolerant even of insensibility, 'casts out no phase of life through impatience'. To write a short essay on Shakespeare and carry the applause of the reader is to succeed. Mr. Taylor rises to the test. None will read his treatment of the sonnets and their echoes in the plays without regretting that Mr. Taylor had not the space to deal more fully with his theme.

The section on Philosophy and Science lies for the most part outside the field of English Studies. Enough has been said of the rest of the book to indicate the quality of this section.

The ground that Mr. Taylor has surveyed in *Thought and Expression* is familiar to a wider range of readers than he could appeal to in *The Mediaeval Mind*. For this reason his necessary

omissions and compressions will provoke the criticism of those who have special knowledge of this or that plot of the ground. Mr. Taylor's book will nevertheless correct the fault of the specialists by directing their attention to the things of true value, and by showing them that history is not a record of static fact but of movement and growth. Mr. Taylor's earlier studies on the ancient and mediaeval worlds give him the right to speak on the Renaissance, although he eschews the word, for the good reason that the Renaissance grew like everything else out of its own past and was itself as new as was once the ancient world.

In 1913 the Comtesse de Chambrun devoted some space in her study on *The Sonnets of Shakespeare* (Putnam) to John Florio, the translator of Montaigne and sometime Italian-master to Shakespeare's patron, Southampton. She has now followed this up with a study of the life and works of Florio,⁴ and a detailed examination of the evidences that appear to support her thesis that Shakespeare's acquaintance with Florio and his works is widely apparent in the plays. Speaking broadly she has a good case, and her book merits the attention of Shakespearians, but it is marred by an obvious anxiety to omit nothing, however slight its relevance, that may appear to support her thesis.

The Florios, like the Diodati, were Italian Protestants denized in England, who married English wives. Theodore Diodati, whose son Charles was Milton's friend, helped Florio with his *Montaigne*. The same Theodore taught Italian to Sir John Harington, the translator of Ariosto. One would have liked to see this interesting biographical field adequately explored, but on the life of Florio, the author has nothing new. Her researches have not been biographical.

The Comtesse de Chambrun is, however, the fortunate owner of all Florio's works except Ramusio's *Voyages*, and the main value of her dissertation comes from the full and ingenious use she has made of this valuable material. The works are (1) *Florio: His First Fruits* (1578), (2) *Ramusio's Voyages* (1580), (3) *Florio's Second Fruits* (1591), (4) *A Woorlde of Words* (1598), (5) *The Essays*

⁴ *Giovanni Florio, Un Apôtre de la Renaissance en Angleterre*, by Longworth-Chambrun. Paris: Payot. 20 f.

... of... Montaigne (1603), (6) *Queen Anna's New World of Words* (1611).

The *First* and *Second Fruits* are miscellanies intended to form an introduction to the study of the Italian language. They contain proverbs, dialogues, a Grammar, and general observations. *The Woorld of Words* is an Italian-English dictionary. To the *Woorld of Words* one regrets that Florio did not add the English-Italian supplement that he apparently projected, for hidden away there are many words and phrases—*rialto*, *bezonian*, *rude mechanicals*—of interest to Shakesperian students. In citing instances of these and equally interesting imported words such as *festinate*, the Countess sometimes omits to note the edition she is quoting. The prefaces and dedicatory epistles to the works which are all reprinted as appendices will be of considerable value to scholars.

That Florio the pedant and Shakespeare the playwright moved in the same circle has long been admitted, and Mr. Arthur Acheson has recently asked us to accept some highly improbable deductions from this admission. Compared with Mr. Acheson, the Comtesse de Chambrun is reasonable in her demands. She accepts Warburton's assertion, however, that Florio is ridiculed in *Holofernes*, a supposition difficult to accept if we are to think of Shakespeare as continuing to draw on his victim for all the hints and suggestions that she indicates.

The chapter on 'Concordances' is an unsatisfactory medley of admirable and negligible citations. There can be no value, not even the value that comes of cumulative effect, in claiming as borrowings from Florio some fifteen common proverbs, most of which are to be found in John Heywood's *Proverbs*. On the other hand, the passage in *Macbeth* on the 'temple-haunting martlets' seems to re-echo Montaigne and may have come through Florio. Other parallels cited are worthy of examination, but the theme of the 'seven ages of man' had had a time-honoured career, and is valueless as evidence that Shakespeare saw Florio's *Montaigne* in manuscript.

It is suggested that Shakespeare owed his French to Florio on the ground that it was bookish, and not the sort of French that his association with the Mountjoys and his other French friends would have taught him. This cannot be taken seriously. In any case the dramatist is not airing his French, in *Henry V*, but

writing the kind of French his audience would enjoy and understand.

It is this piling up of supports injudiciously selected that disturbs the reader. We are asked to assume that four references to Machiavelli imply Shakespeare's indebtedness to Florio's general Italian influence, yet two are from *Henry VI* and one from *The London Prodigal*, 'que nous croyons due à la plume du grand poète'.

It would be unjust, however, to pass by the many admirable features of the book, and to leave the impression that the study is wanting in restraint. The First Part—*The Life and Works*—fills a long-felt need, and is almost wholly admirable. The Second Part—*Shakespeare and Florio*—is less satisfactory, but chiefly because the writer seeks doubtful aids in a good cause. It should be added that, besides its useful appendices, the book has numerous photogravure facsimiles of interest.

The aim of Mr. Williams's article on *Epic Unity*⁵ is to examine chronologically the various theories on the subject of Epic Unity propounded by critical writers in Italy in the half-century from Vida (1527), a period in which the problem was variously treated until it reached in Castelvetro (1576) its final development in the conception of the three unities.

Following Bywater's *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, Mr. Williams opens with a summary of Aristotle's doctrine and precepts. He summarizes the Italian interpretations of Aristotle published during the half-century, showing how critical opinion adapted, by stretching it, the doctrine of the Unity of Action to cover the episodic romance of Ariosto, until Castelvetro found dramatic unity of action to be subordinate to, being consequent on, the unities of time and place. On the relations of dramatic to epic unity Mr. Williams writes with discernment and lucidity, and his article is a welcome contribution to a subject on which there is too much loose talk.

Without any claims to completeness, and without technicalities, Miss Hickey's⁶ article offers a suggestive outline of some of the

⁵ *Epic Unity as discussed by Sixteenth-Century Critics in Italy*, by Ralph C. Williams (*Modern Philology*, xviii).

⁶ *The Making of English Blank-Verse*, by Emily Hickey (*The Nineteenth Century and After*, Dec. 1920).

earlier developments in English blank-verse that will be welcomed by many who like unpretentious writing. A useful sketch of Italian non-riming verse and Surrey's indebtedness to Italian blank-verse precedes a more detailed examination of the Tudor poets. The treatment of the *pause* is happily illustrated.

Dr. Hillebrand's article⁷ forms a useful supplement to Dr. Rimbault's edition of *The Old Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal, 1560-1643* (Camden Society, New Series No. 3), the Bodleian duplicate of which Dr. Hillebrand now reprints for the first time with indications of all departures from Rimbault's original. These are numerous, especially in the seventeenth century. Of particular interest are the precedents which form an appendix to the duplicate giving directions for the guidance of the treasury, showing scales of payment, noting grants of relief from taxation, and detailing the expenses of the choir that accompanied the King's progress into Scotland in 1633. Dr. Hillebrand prefaces his reprint with a valuable essay on the early history of the Chapel Royal in which he uses new material bearing upon the impressing of choristers, an infliction from which St. Paul's and the Royal Chapel claimed immunity. For the period before 1560, Household Regulations and Statutes and Wardrobe Books are re-examined, but the personnel of the Chapel is only intermittently found before we reach *The Cheque Book*. Dr. Hillebrand, however, finds several new lists in the Chamberlain's Wardrobe accounts which have interest as further limiting the field of surmise. Added interest is attached to the general increment in fees granted by James I, who also revived the practice of sending boys to the University, by the remark endorsed on the page stating the increments, 'Cursed be the partie that taketh this leafe out of this booke'.

Canon H. F. Westlake⁸ notes a lease by Abbot Islip dated Aug. 8, 1518, of a tenement on the south side of the great belfry 'in quo tenemento Johannes Skelton laureatus modo inhabitat'. The south-west corner of the present Middlesex County Hall may be

⁷ *The Early History of the Chapel Royal*, by Harold N. Hillebrand (*Modern Philology*, xviii, 5, Sept. 1920).

⁸ *John Skelton*, by H. F. Westlake (*The Times Literary Supplement*, Oct. 27, 1921).

taken as indicating the site. Canon Westlake is in error in associating Skelton's earlier residence with his sanctuary at Westminster. He was on good terms with Wolsey after his appointment as sole Legate in 1519, but having a friend in Islip was sheltered by him when he had to flee from Wolsey's wrath 'pro vita seruanda' (Bale). He died in sanctuary in June 1529.

An article by the present writer⁹ supplies new facts about the career of John Rastell, the printer, who was brother-in-law of Sir Thomas More, father-in-law of John Heywood, and great-grandfather of John Donne. He was a Coventry man, and held the office of Coroner until he established himself in London in the early years of Henry VIII's reign, where he printed the great volume of Fitzherbert's *Grand Abridgment* in the same year as the *Utopia* appeared. Six months later he attempted a voyage to the New Found Lands, but was victimized by his mariners. The discovery of the depositions of witnesses in Rastell's prosecution of the sailors explains his reference to his misadventure in the play of *The Four Elements*.

He was interested in pageantry as well as plays, and was employed in devising and erecting the roofs at the Field of the Cloth of Gold. His other pageants are described in the article. After a life full of activity he joined More in his controversial attack upon Tyndall and the 'heretics'. His *Boke of Purgatory* is interesting for the light it throws on the authorship of *Gentleness and Nobility*, which may be claimed for Rastell, whose hand is also indicated in *Calisto and Melibcea*. Rastell was won over to the side of the Reformers in the course of his controversies, and died in prison a year after the execution of his brother-in-law, Sir Thomas More. The site of the stage which Rastell erected in his grounds in Finsbury Fields (c. 1525) has particular interest for its proximity to that of Burbage's well-known theatre of fifty years later.

Another article in the same volume on the *Regulation of the Book Trade*¹⁰ is based upon a series of proceedings recorded in the

⁹ *John Rastell, Printer, Lawyer, Venture, Dramatist, and Controversialist*, by A. W. Reed. (Transactions of the Bibliographical Society, xv, 1917-19. [Pubd. 1920]).

¹⁰ *The Regulation of the Book Trade before the Proclamation of 1538*, by A. W. Reed. (Transactions of the Bibliographical Society, xv.)

consistorial records at Somerset House. Its interest lies in its references to definite works, e. g. Margaret Roper's translation of the *Paternoster* of Erasmus, one of the offending books suspected of Lutheran tendencies, as well as the evidence it discovers of the relations of the printers to Wolsey and the ecclesiastical authorities. The article also investigates the origin of the phrase used in royal privileges *Ad imprimendum solum* which first appears as a correction in the hand of Henry VIII himself. The meaning of this phrase, which has been a matter of dispute, is probably now determined.

VI

SHAKESPEARE

[By SIDNEY LEE]

SHAKESPEARIAN criticism and research have engaged a considerable amount of energy during the year 1921, but nothing of first importance has been achieved. Speculation has been busy in many directions; the results are often interesting but rarely conclusive.

5

Professor Odell, of Columbia University, to whom the chief honours of the year in this section are due, has rendered students of Shakespeare valiant service in his history of Shakespeare on the London stage for approximately two centuries and a half.¹ Professor Odell's book is a thoroughly readable piece of exhaustive research. The narrative begins with the reopening of the London theatres after the Restoration of 1660, and ends with the retirement of Sir Henry Irving in 1902 from his prolonged career as a producer of Shakespeare. The author's main aim is to describe the various modes in which theatrical managers dealt with Shakespeare's text. But he has gone far beyond the textual aspects of his subject. He treats with great fullness the history of the London theatres where Shakespearian drama was represented, and defines the varying methods of its presentation. 'Scenery, machinery, costumes, pageantry, spectacle, music, song, dancing', all receive minute attention. The result is the most complete and comprehensive study that exists of the fortunes of Shakespeare's plays at the hands of English actors and managers.

Professor Odell divides his theme into seven sections, viz.: The Age of Betterton, The Age of Cibber, The Age of Garrick, The Age of Kemble, The Leaderless Age (1817-37), The Age of

¹ *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, by George C. D. Odell, Professor of English in Columbia University. London: Constable, 1921. 2 vols. i, xiv + 456 pp.; ii, xiii + 498 pp.

Macready, The Age of Phelps and Charles Kean, and The Age of Irving. In an Epilogue entitled 'Recent Tendencies', Professor Odell briefly describes the experiments of Mr. William Poel and Mr. Granville Barker. He faintly praises Mr. Poel's method and frankly condemns Mr. Barker's. But his general purpose is expository rather than critical, and he leaves his abundant testimony to speak for itself.

Professor Odell's researches show that through the first five of his seven Ages, Shakespeare's work on the stage was invariably subjected to the double process of drastic abbreviation and wholesale revision. No play in the authentic text of the First Folio or of a trustworthy Quarto came to the notice of theatrical audiences during the late seventeenth century or at any period of the eighteenth. Even Garrick, despite his gifts of interpretation, 'improved' Shakespeare without any compunction. In the early years of Queen Victoria's reign Macready initiated a salutary reform in the way of textual accuracy, yet this eminent actor-manager never went the length of giving a Shakespearian play in full.

Macready's successors, Phelps, Charles Kean, Irving, and Tree remained loyal to his rule of textual veracity, but none of them advanced on Macready's defective standards of textual completeness. Indeed, scenes were omitted and inverted with a new freedom in order to meet the requirements of the growing tendency to scenic pageantry. The scenic splendours of Shakespearian production reached their full height at the call of Irving and Tree. The processes of this development are described by Professor Odell in graphic detail, the value of which is enhanced by the pictorial illustrations. Contemporary taste would now seem to have revolted against the over-elaboration of the scenic setting which distinguished the past era. The change of sentiment is welcome. But simplicity of setting will hardly ensure Shakespeare's continued popularity with the theatrical public unless it be accompanied by histrionic efficiency of the high order which is associated with such names as Garrick, Edmund Kean, and Irving.

The general reader of whatever age, when beginning a study of Shakespeare's Plays, can have no better guidance than that which Dr. F. S. Boas provides in his slender booklet entitled 'An Intro-

duction to the Reading of Shakspeare.'² Dr. Boas offers his reader 'infinite riches in a little room'. He treats, with a brevity which he manages to reconcile with scholarly adequacy, well-nigh all the topics with which it is to the obvious advantage of a beginner to acquaint himself. He will learn from Dr. Boas's pages how the plays were published, how they were produced on the Tudor stage, and how the dramatist used his library, besides gaining some knowledge of the essential features of Shakespeare's gifts of characterization and of language. A final section luminously defines Shakespeare's appeal to the modern mind. Although in this work Dr. Boas does not address himself to the specialist, it is not unworthy of a place in the specialist's library, so skilfully does the author summarize the main results of recent research. At the same time it should be understood that Dr. Boas never writes over the head of the intelligent neophyte, who is to be congratulated on having ready access to so stimulating a counsellor in the early stages of his Shakespearian study.

The Cambridge University Press deserves praise for its courage in undertaking a new edition of Shakespeare, *The New Shakespeare*, of which the first three volumes appeared last year.³ There are many features in this edition which 'the modern reader' and 'the ordinary lover of Shakspeare', for whom the editors tell us that it is intended, are likely to welcome. The admirable typography, the shape of the volumes which are fitted for the pocket, the interesting frontispieces, the brief glossaries, the appendices on stage history (by Mr. Harold Child) are all attractive. The bold amplifications of the traditional stage directions are helpful, even if many appear to be supererogatory. The high price of the volumes is regrettable, however exorbitant may be the current scale of manufacturing costs.

The editorial scheme deserves the credit of admirable intentions, but many points in its execution suggest defects of judgement. The two editors, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and Mr. Dover Wilson,

² *An Introduction to the Reading of Shakspeare*, by F. S. Boas, M.A., LL.D. [1920]. London: Duckworth. 72 pp.

³ *The New Shakespeare*. Edited by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson. *The Tempest*. ix+116 pp. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. xx+110 pp. *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. xl+149 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1921.

have rather contrasted qualifications, and the division between them of the editorial labours, which are appropriate to their respective faculties, fails to exclude some discrepancies which would be better away. Sir Arthur supplies the literary information and criticism out of which the General Introduction and the special Introductions to individual plays are naturally woven. Sir Arthur's essays form attractive reading. His coadjutor, Mr. Dover Wilson, furnishes an *apparatus criticus* of a novel kind which lends the edition, in the scholar's eye, its most distinctive character. The two editors follow different paths, yet their work is at times inadequately co-ordinated, and some incongruities result. For example, Sir Arthur bestows high eulogy on the nineteenth century's 'great discovery of the chronological order in which Shakespeare wrote his plays'. It is, therefore, disconcerting to find that Mr. Dover Wilson, who is responsible for the textual arrangement of the edition, pays no heed to that discovery when adopting the First Folio's time-honoured order of presenting the plays—an order which is unaffected by chronology. In his long and comprehensive Introduction to *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Sir Arthur covers, in his own interesting fashion, much of the ground which Mr. Wilson goes over again in more technical detail in his elaborate Appendix on the relations between the text of the First Folio version of the play and that of the Quarto of 1602. It is hardly needful for the same topic to be treated twice—each time from a somewhat different angle.

It is to Mr. Dover Wilson's credit that he should endeavour to evolve a text which shall respect scientific principles. Probably no editor has submitted Shakespeare's text to quite so searching a scrutiny, certainly no editor has claimed with greater confidence ability to pluck out the heart of all the textual mysteries. He seeks to define with precision the relations existing between Shakespeare's manuscript and the early printed editions of his work. He is thoroughly convinced that Shakespeare was a supreme master of a system of punctuation, on which he relied in order to give full effect to the dramatic intention of his words. The dramatist's method of punctuation, according to Mr. Wilson, is 'dramatic, that is to say it is a question of pause, emphasis, and intonation, and it is quite independent of syntax'. The early editions are credited by Mr. Wilson, with reproducing

faithfully the punctuation of Shakespeare's devising. With the view of enabling the reader of this edition to visualize Shakespeare's 'dramatic' mode of punctuation, Mr. Wilson has formulated a series of new typographical symbols, the unfamiliarity of which makes them rather puzzling.

Mr. Wilson presents his textual conclusions with much skill and abundant enthusiasm, but no dispassionate observer can deny that they rest on unstable foundations of conjecture and hypothesis. Mr. Wilson, like all explorers of uncharted territory, too often falls a victim to the tendency of making hypothesis do duty for proved fact. Too many of his bricks are made without straw. Before one can positively determine the accuracy with which a printed text follows an author's manuscript, one must have access to authentic specimens of the author's writing, at any rate ample enough for the purpose. The long-cherished dream of discovering a play by Shakespeare in his autograph has not yet been realized. It is true that Sir Edward Maunde Thompson has tentatively pledged his high palaeographical authority to the identification with Shakespeare's handwriting of a scene from the play of *Sir Thomas More* in a British Museum MS. (Harl. MS. 7368, 8a, 8b, 9a). But Sir Edward's conclusion, which is necessarily speculative, is a questionable basis for any large deduction. Mr. Wilson, on the other hand, regards 'the Shakespearian addition to *Sir Thomas More* as an instrument of the highest value for an editor of Shakespeare', and proceeds to the emendation of apparently corrupt passages on the assumption that we possess full knowledge of Shakespeare's habits of penmanship. The question of Shakespeare's method of punctuation stands on much the same footing. The inquiries into this matter which Mr. Percy Simpson and Mr. A. W. Pollard have undertaken have led to attractive conjectures. Many affirmative instances of a 'dramatic' method of punctuation have been detected in the First Folio and 'good' Shakespeare Quartos, but the ultimate significance of such instances remains in doubt until the negative instances, which are often more numerous, have received equally close attention.

But Mr. Wilson, heedless of quicksands, goes on his way triumphing. In one place he writes :

'In short we believe that we know how Shakespeare wrote; we have a definite clue to his system of punctuation; we feel

confident that often nothing but a compositor stands between us and the original manuscript; we can at times even creep into the compositor's skin and catch glimpses of the manuscript through his eyes. The door of Shakespeare's workshop stands ajar.'

In regard to Shakespeare's alleged mastery of the mysteries of a 'dramatic' system of punctuation, Mr. Wilson indulges in strains which are almost lyrical:

'A comma indicates a short pause, a semicolon a longer one, a colon one longer still, and a full stop . . . a full stop, which sometimes occurs in the middle of a sentence. Further, absence of punctuation, where a modern reader would expect to find it, implies rapid delivery. Brackets, on the other hand, affect intonation rather than speed. Often they denote the drop in the voice which a parenthesis demands; but there are many beautiful instances which mark a much more significant change of tone: a hushed whisper, a touch of anxiety, a note of tenderness, surprise or awe. In the same way the pause, especially with the semicolon, the colon or the period, often needs filling by a sob, a kiss, or by other and lengthier "business". As he wrote Shakespeare had the living voice ever sounding in his ears, the flesh and blood of his creations ever moving before his eyes.'

It is, then, in Shakespeare's 'stops' that we must seek for the final proofs of his dramatic genius. To Mr. Wilson's statement one is almost tempted to apply the words of Miranda: 'Your tale, Sir, would cure deafness.'

Mr. Douglas Ainslie does his fellow-countrymen a notable service by giving them access, in their own language, to the estimate which Benedetto Croce, the eminent aesthetic philosopher of Italy, has formed of Shakespeare's genius and work.⁴ Although Croce's volume includes critical essays on Ariosto and Corneille, 225 of the 430 pages in Mr. Ainslie's rendering are devoted to Shakespeare, so that the book may be reckoned in the main a contribution to Shakespearean criticism. Mr. Ainslie has on the whole done his work well. But, as Mr. J. M. Robertson has pointed out in his recently published *Croce as Shakespearean Critic* (London, 1922), he has made a few slips which somewhat confuse the argument. It is unfortunate

⁴*Ariosto, Shakespeare, and Corneille*, by Benedetto Croce, translated by Douglas Ainslie. London: Allen & Unwin, 1921.

that Croce, in Mr. Ainslie's version, should stigmatize all biographies of Shakespeare as 'faulty', whereas the Italian word which Croce uses is *lacunosa*, an epithet with which no one would quarrel. At the same time we admit the extreme difficulty of reproducing, in another tongue, all the nuances of Croce's vocabulary.

Croce opens his dissertation with a denial of any fruitful relation between the proved facts of Shakespeare's biography and his dramatic and poetic achievement. Nor does the Italian critic allow that study of the history of the poet's time or conjectures about his personal experience are of any relevance to a critical inquiry into the character or value of his work. Investigation into Shakespeare's sources or the course of his reading, into the textual history or bibliography of his publications, into contemporary conditions of the theatre, is all banished from Croce's arena. Again, the Italian writer professes scorn for what he calls the 'exclamatory' criticism of English critics, who 'drown' Shakespeare 'beneath a flood of superlatives'. In this category he seems to place Victor Hugo at the side of Carlyle and of Swinburne; the last he regards as the arch offender. Nor does Croce view with complaisance 'those insipid moralizing professors' who profess to discover in Shakespeare's plays illustration of specific moral or philosophic doctrines. Almost all the German critics consequently come under Croce's ban. It is a relief to learn from a few lines at the close of Croce's denunciatory chapter on 'criticism' that 'some correct thinking' about Shakespeare is to be found in the pages, among older writers, of Herder, Goethe, Schlegel, Coleridge, and Manzoni, and 'among the Dowdens, the Bradleys, and the Raleighs of to-day'.

Some pleas in arrest of judgement might easily be urged on many counts of the large indictment which Croce brings against preceding writers on Shakespeare. Few scholars will accept without much qualification his depreciatory view of biographical and textual research. A knowledge which rests on tested evidence of Shakespeare's practical affairs is necessary to the formation of any trustworthy conception of the poet's individuality or personality. Biography, which came into being at the call of mankind's commemorative instinct, can never be safely disregarded by those who seek to estimate justly and fully a dead hero's work, to whatever department of activity it belongs.

At the same time it is fair to judge Croce by his manner of applying to Shakespeare's drama his original aesthetic theories, rather than by his attacks on those who have approached Shakespearean study by different roads. Croce works on the assumption that a poet's work is an isolated entity, and must be examined without reference to external circumstance. It must be minutely scrutinized *in vacuo*. By no other means will the critic be able to distinguish the individual 'sentiment' which impregnates the whole and lends it its particular form and substance. There may be apparent variations in the working of the individual 'sentiment', but it never loses its essential homogeneity. Shakespeare's individual 'sentiment' is, according to Croce, a dynamic force for ever assimilating and refashioning the dominant energies of life. It creates for him the world in which he moves as poet and dramatist. That world, although it give a convincing illusion of reality, remains a world of which no one but himself has enjoyed the vision or grasped the full significance. His dramas are the realizations of his individual and unique endeavour to exhibit his world at work. His art, the form in which he embodies his aim, is created by what Croce calls the 'content' of his mind, the character of the world which lives there. Matter and manner are all of one piece, and although they may not always deserve the same measure of praise, everything that fell from Shakespeare's pen bears witness to the essential oneness of the power behind it.

Whatever may be thought of Croce's aesthetic theories, and of their competence to solve the mystery of Shakespeare's genius, there is no likelihood of difference of opinion respecting Croce's triumphant success in his critical appreciations of Shakespeare's characterization. His remarks on *Macbeth* and other of the great tragedies, apart from any theorizing, abound in subtlety and penetration. At whatever point the Italian critic touches the concrete details of Shakespearean drama, he gives proof of luminous insight. Could one eliminate the controversial element from Croce's essay it might deserve admission to the first rank of Shakespearean criticism.

Miss Lilian Winstanley, who has already given many proofs of her erudite knowledge of Elizabethan Literature, breaks new ground in an endeavour to determine the interpretation which an Elizabethan

audience would set on Shakespeare's play of *Hamlet* at its first production.⁵ She is of opinion that the Elizabethan point of view can only be reached through 'the careful study of the history of the time'. Shakespeare's plays should not, according to Miss Winstanley, be studied in the light of modern psychology, but in that of the quite different psychology of his own day. Miss Winstanley's original method of critical inquiry leads to startling results.

As we understand Miss Winstanley's proposition, Shakespeare's characters and episodes were deliberately topical in their original intention, and only by mysterious accident did they acquire in the eyes of critics of later days their attributes of universality. The Elizabethan dramatist set out to fulfil certain obligations, barely intelligible nowadays, which his audience habitually imposed upon him. The playgoer required Shakespeare to bring on the stage characters and fables which plainly mirrored, under a thin veil of illusion, familiar leaders and incidents of current political life. Miss Winstanley has studied the play of *Hamlet* in the light of these assumptions. She would have us believe that the dramatist chose the old Danish legend as the foundation of his tragedy owing to the opportunity which the theme offered of presenting in dramatic disguise notorious events of contemporary history. Both Shakespeare and his audience were at the time obsessed by two political crises. One touched the claim of James VI, King of Scotland, to succeed to the English throne when Queen Elizabeth's long reign should end. The other political question at urgent issue was the fate of the Earl of Essex and his fellow conspirators. The fortunes and character of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* form a commentary on these insistent political problems which the audience was anxious for the dramatist to discuss on the stage. We learn that traits of both King James and the Earl of Essex are clearly visible in Shakespeare's delineation of his Danish Prince, in whom there also mingle some touches of the Earl of Southampton, the Earl of Essex's friend and the dramatist's own patron. Readers must be referred to Miss Winstanley's volume for her confirmatory evidence

⁵ *Hamlet and the Scottish Succession*. Being an examination of the relations of the play of *Hamlet* to the Scottish Succession and the Essex Conspiracy. By Lilian Winstanley. Cambridge University Press, 1921. x + 188 pp.

of this highly original theory. At a first view there springs to one's mind Charles Lamb's impatient comment on 'Landon's unfeeling allegorizing away of honest Quixote': 'He may as well say Strap [the loyal comrade of Roderick Random in Smollett's novel] is meant to symbolize the Scottish nation before the Union, and Random (the Scottish nation) since that Act of dubious issue. . . . *Gebir* [Landon's epic], indeed, may mean the state of the Hop-markets last month for anything I know to the contrary.' (Lamb's letter to Southey, 1st August 1825.) ~

Mr. Gerald Friedlander has brought together various versions of the old story of a Jew's loan of money to a Christian, which forms the leading theme of Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*.⁶ He cites at the end of his volume a scene from Lessing's sympathetic dramatic study of *Nathan der Weise*, by way of contrast with what he deems to be Shakespeare's harsh interpretation of Jewish character. Mr. Friedlander's researches are superficial. He merely collects material which is already familiar to students, and his conclusions do bare justice to Shakespeare's achievement. The brief preface by Mr. Moscovitch, the masterly interpreter of Shylock on the stage, is not very illuminating, but some interest attaches to the actor's suggestion that Shylock's conduct has justification.

There is no end to the speculative ingenuity which Shakespeare's Sonnets provoke. Mr. Hubert Ord has brought together many passages from Chaucer's works which have certain affinities in sentiment and language with passages in Shakespeare's Sonnets.⁷ But the resemblances are not very close, and are hardly sufficient to justify the conclusion that Shakespeare was familiar with Chaucer's poetry. Mr. Ord, however, goes so far as to formulate a theory that some of Shakespeare's Sonnets celebrate allegorically Chaucer's fame, and that 'the rival poet' is to be identified with either Chaucer or with Chaucer's editor of 1602, Thomas Speght. Mr. Ord's original theory is not likely to win acceptance.

⁶ *Shakespeare and the Jew*, by Gerald Friedlander, with an introduction by Maurice Moscovitch. London: George Routledge. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1921. viii + 79 pp.

⁷ *Chaucer and the Rival Poet in Shakespeare's Sonnets*. A New Theory by Hubert Ord, M.A. J. M. Dent, London and Toronto, 1921. pp. 1-63.

Professor R. S. Conway, in his '*New Studies of a Great Inheritance*', being lectures on the modern worth of some ancient writers' (London, John Murray, 1921), includes a study of the classical elements in Shakespeare's *Tempest* (pp. 165-89). Professor Conway is on familiar ground when he finds the source of Prospero's renunciation of his practice of magic (v. i. 33 sq.) in Golding's translation of Medea's invocation in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (vii, 197 sqq.). But a more original note is struck when Professor Conway claims for many single lines and phrases and for some larger issues of the plot of *The Tempest* indebtedness on Shakespeare's part to Virgil. The verbal resemblances are interesting, though they hardly prove that Shakespeare borrowed directly from the great Roman poet. Professor Conway points out that some part of Gonzalo's description of the Golden Age was anticipated by Virgil in his *Georgics*. Yet here Shakespeare owed nothing tangible to the Roman poet, for he was directly adapting a passage from Montaigne in Florio's English version. The influence which Virgil may have exerted on Montaigne barely concerns Shakespeare. Professor Conway detects in Virgil's *Aeneid* and in Shakespeare's *Tempest* an identical conception of a benevolent Providence in control of human affairs. Prospero's outlook on the world which Professor Conway identifies with Virgil's scarcely stands in need of classical elucidation, and offers slender proof of Shakespeare's study of Virgil's epic.

Most of the apparent resemblances between classical and Shakespearean thought and phraseology may be fairly assigned to accidental coincidence. Occasionally Shakespeare assimilates classical language or sentiment at second- or third-hand. It may be admitted that, despite the wide interval which separates him from the classical text, he often comes surprisingly close to the Greek or Latin turn of phrase, but the rapprochement is attributable to Shakespeare's sureness of literary touch. Conscious pursuit of classical models is rarely discernible.

M. de Pourtalès' translation of Shakespeare's subtle comedy of *Measure for Measure*^a illustrates the merits and defects inherent

^a William Shakespeare. '*Mesure pour Mesure*.' Traduction et Préface de Guy de Pourtalès. Ornaments gravés sur bois par Jean-Louis Gampert. Paris: Société Littéraire de France, 1921. xxxi + 152 pp.

in all efforts to reproduce Shakespeare in a foreign tongue. M. de Pourtalès' French style is clear and vivid, and luminously conveys to the reader Shakespeare's general intention. Yet Shakespeare's subtleties of thought and expression seem often to evaporate in the French atmosphere. Something is missed when the Duke's pessimistic reflection 'There is scarce truth enough alive to make societies secure' is rendered as 'La bonne foi est trop rare pour que les relations sociales soient sûres'. *Ex uno omnia*. Yet M. de Pourtalès has done his work as well as the conditions allow. In the Preface, he writes agnostically of the biographical information regarding Shakespeare. In his criticism of the play, he leaves out of account Shakespeare's indebtedness to the Italian novelist Giral di Cinthio, and consequently ignores Shakespeare's marvellous and crucial remodelling of the Italian writer's *dénouement*. But M. de Pourtalès shows critical insight in his comment on the philosophy of life which Shakespeare's play embodies.

Under the title of 'Shakespeare Treads the Boards' Mr. M. H. Spielmann contributed to *The Times Literary Supplement* on 1st December 1921, an interesting account of English and foreign plays which presented the poet as the leading character. A second article by Mr. Spielmann which followed on 2nd February 1922 greatly expanded the information touching this curious literary by-way. Mr. Spielmann's researches finally showed that Shakespeare has figured in person, between the end of the eighteenth century and the present time, in no less than 69 dramatic pieces, comic as well as serious. As many as six languages, English, German, French, Italian, Spanish, and Dutch, have been pressed into this service. It is in no way surprising that Germany should be foremost in this romantic field with 31 pieces as against 28 pieces of British or American origin.

Two English contributions to the long series of plays in which Shakespeare fills the rôle of hero have been published during the year under review. They deserve brief notice, if only as evidence of the attraction which Shakespeare's personal history exerts on dramatic ambition.

The five 'episodes' which form Messrs. Rubinstein and Bax's

play of Shakespeare⁹ are, as is customary in this manner of work, quite imaginary. Although the authors show signs of familiarity with recent research into Shakespeare's biography, they interpret their knowledge with far greater freedom than exact scholarship justifies. Their endeavour is to reconcile in the light of the imagination the apparently contradictory strains of worldliness and idealism in Shakespeare's character. They propound a puzzle which they can scarcely be said to have solved. Yet the theme is illustrated with some ingenuity. The concluding 'episode' at New Place in January 1616 shows Shakespeare, who has just made his will, rejecting the admiring worship of Thomas Quiney, the suitor of his daughter Judith, who is represented as a youth with poetic ambitions. The dramatist will only assent to Quiney's marriage with his daughter on condition that the young man forsake the Muses and devote himself to trade. It is to the credit of the authors that their dramatic speech gives the Elizabethan illusion without archaic pedantry. As Mr. Pollard says in his Introduction: 'It is extraordinarily difficult to make Elizabethans talk without their talk jarring on the reader who has even a slight acquaintance with Elizabethan English as incongruous and impossible. The talk in this play very seldom jars.'

The second drama on the poet's personality and history which came out last year is Miss Clemence Dane's ambitious 'Invention' entitled *Will Shakespeare*, which enjoyed a brief but chequered run on the stage.¹⁰ Miss Dane's style has its charms. She handles blank-verse with spirited freedom, even if the phraseology is often unduly elusive. Yet it may be doubted if a genuinely artistic purpose be served by quite so bold a travesty of historic fact. No plausible conception of Shakespeare's character excuses the author's bold defiance of biographic evidence or critical exegesis. The gloomy neurotic amorist who masquerades as Shakespeare in Miss Dane's play scarcely deserves his proud appellation.

⁹ *Shakespeare. A Play in Five Episodes*. By H. F. Rubinstein and Clifford Bax. With a Preface by A. W. Pollard. London: Benn Brothers, 1921. x+117 pp.

¹⁰ *Will Shakespeare, An Invention in Four Acts*, by Clemence Dane. London: William Heinemann, 1921. viii+131 pp.

In her characterization of Queen Elizabeth, Miss Dane has come nearer success in the dramatic interpretation of an historic personage, but everywhere else she has allowed her fancy to run riot to the distortion of historic veracity. Miss Dane shows small respect for Shakespeare's own method of dramatizing history and historic character. Shakespeare rarely travelled far from the available historical record. His imagination only created new episode or action in order to make the historic canvas live the more convincingly. Miss Dane's dramatic medley of undisciplined passion and commonplace intrigue would suffer little if the dramatis personae were deprived of their historic names and bore less familiar appellations of her own invention.

The initial publication of the recently-founded Dugdale Society is a finely-printed volume.¹¹ The Society aims at promoting and fostering 'the study of Warwickshire History, Topography, and Archaeology by printing records and other Manuscript materials'. The book before us sheds welcome light on the municipal and social conditions amid which Shakespeare was born and bred. Forthcoming volumes will present the records of the Stratford-upon-Avon Corporation down to the date of Shakespeare's death, and four years beyond. There has been no earlier endeavour to print in full the minutes and accounts of the Council of the Town, which was incorporated on the 28th June 1553, scarcely eleven years before the poet's birth. Extracts have already been printed by Halliwell-Phillipps, Malone, and others. But the full records are now made accessible to students for the first time, and all phases of municipal life with which Shakespeare was familiar are vividly illustrated. Mr. Fripp's Introduction is a competent performance, and directs attention to many new points in the history of Shakespeare's native place.

¹¹ *Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-upon-Avon and Other Records 1553-1620*. Transcribed by Richard Savage, Secretary and Librarian of the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, and Deputy-Keeper of the Records of the Corporation of Stratford-upon-Avon from 1884 to 1910. With Introduction and Notes by Edgar I. Fripp, B.A., London, late Lecturer to the London, Liverpool, and Belfast University Extensions. i, 1553-66. Oxford: Printed for the Dugdale Society, by Frederick Hall, Printer to the University, 1921.

The Site of the Globe Playhouse is a thorough piece of research into a mass of extant legal records, and reflects great credit on its author, Mr. W. W. Braines, a Principal Assistant in the office of the Clerk of the London County Council.¹² That Shakespeare's famous theatre abutted on the small thoroughfare in Southwark, now known as Park Street, near the Bankside, has long been known, and in 1909 a commemorative Tablet was placed on the south side of the street, on the outer wall of Messrs. Barclay and Perkins' brewery, which was long identified with the site of the Theatre. Subsequently Dr. C. W. Wallace claimed to deduce from newly discovered documents the disturbing conclusion that the Globe Theatre stood on the *north* and not on the *south* side of Park Street. Mr. Braines' comprehensive inquiries have now decisively confuted Dr. Wallace's argument, and the precise site of the Playhouse on the south side of Park Street may be regarded as authoritatively established.

¹² *The Site of the Globe Playhouse, Southwark*. With an Appendix by the Architect to the Council on the Architecture of the Building. Published by the London County Council [Mr. G. Topham Forrest]. London, 1921.

VII

ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

[By FREDERICK S. BOAS]

DURING the period between November 1920 and the close of 1921, except the comprehensive edition of Sir William Alexander's *Dramatic Works*,¹ the contributions to the study of Elizabethan drama have taken the form of editions of individual plays or of articles in periodicals or the publications of societies. Additions have been made to our biographical and bibliographical knowledge, and problems of authorship have been, in some cases, discussed from new points of view.

Thus the anonymous play, *The Warres of Cyrus King of Persia, against Antiochus King of Assyria, with the Tragical end of Panthaea*, printed in 1594, has been claimed by Mr. W. J. Lawrence for Richard Farrant, and dated about 1578,² on the following grounds.

Among the early manuscript-music preserved in the library at Christ Church, Oxford, is a set of part-books transcribed by Robert Dowe, and dated on the fly-leaf 1581. In this collection is a song beginning, 'Ah, ah, alas! you salt sea-gods', and containing these lines:

You Gods that guide the ghostes
And souls of them that fled,
Send sobs, send sighes, send grievous grones,
And strike poore Panthea dead!
Abradad, Abradad, ah, ah!
Alas! poore Abradad,
My spirit with thine shall lie;
Come Death, alas! O Death most sweet!

This song is attributed in the manuscript² to Farrant, and Mr. Lawrence therefore assigns to him *The Warres of Cyrus*. He is

¹ See below, pp. 90-2.

² *The Earliest Private-Theatre Play*, by W. J. Lawrence (*The Times Literary Supplement*, 11th August 1921).

of opinion that the lament preserved in the Christ Church MS. was sung by Panthea in the fifth act of the play 'immediately before stabbing herself over the body of her battle-slain husband'. On the title-page of the 1594 quarto *The Warres of Cyrus* is said to have been 'played by the children of her Maiesties Chappell', and Mr. Lawrence therefore identifies the piece as one of those performed during Farrant's management of the first Blackfriars Theatre from the end of 1576 to 1580, 'probably the unnamed play mentioned in the Revels Accounts as having been given by Farrant's boys before the Queen at Richmond on 27th December 1578.'

These speculations are interesting, and they have this in their favour, that the story of Panthea and Abradatas, from Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, is not likely to have been treated by many hands. But, as Mr. Lawrence himself frankly states, in the British Museum Additional MSS. 17786, f. 91, 'a collection later than and inferior to Dowe's', Panthea's lament is attributed to Robert Parsons, a gentleman of the Chapel Royal, who was drowned in 1570. The evidence of the Christ Church MS. is therefore not conclusive.

*Law Sports at Gray's Inn*³ requires only brief notice. It reproduces *Gesta Grayorum* from the reprint in Nichols' *Progresses of Elizabeth*, but students of the tract have a more accurate version accessible in the Malone Society reprint (1914) from the original quarto published by W. Canning in 1688. Mr. Brown's introductory matter is rambling and of small value, except in one particular. On various grounds Bacon is credited with the authorship of the speeches of the six Privy Councillors in *Gesta Grayorum*. Among these may have been the Lord Chancellor to 'the Prince of Purpoole', who was played by William Johnson. Mr. Brown has discovered that this Johnson was connected with the *capias utlegatum* which Coke, as Attorney-General, cast into Bacon's teeth in the Court of Exchequer in 1601. Sir William Noy's *Reports and Cases* (1656) includes the following: 'Johnson of Grayes-Inne recovered in debt against Bacon of Grays-Inne upon

³ *Law Sports at Gray's Inn* (1594). Including Shakespeare's connexion with the Inn's [sic] of Court, the origin of the *Capias Utlegatum* re Coke and Bacon . . . with a reprint of the *Gesta Grayorum*, by Basil Brown. Privately printed, New York, 1921. xciv+188+88 pp. 15s. net.

a bond of 400 l. Where the condition was to save harmlesse, being surety for *Bacon*. And *Bacon* was outlawed after Judgement: And a *cap. utlagut.* was delivered to the Sheriff in Court.' But against this one 'find' there has to be set much unprofitable and inconsecutive theorizing.

In *Anthony Munday and his Books*⁴ Miss M. St. Clare Byrne discusses more fully *inter alia* the problem of the authorship of *Fedele and Fortunio*, raised incidentally in her article, *The Shepherd Tony—A Recapitulation* (*Modern Language Review*,⁵ October 1920). The difficulty caused by the varying signatures of the dedication, 'A. M.' in the Huntington copy and 'M. A.' in the Mostyn copy, noticed in *The Year's Work in English Studies*, 1919-20 (p. 86 and note), remains unsolved, but Miss Byrne re-states in more detail the arguments in favour of Munday's authorship.

There is much else of interest in her paper. She sketches from external and internal evidence his remarkable career from 1553 to 1633 as 'an actor, prentice, poet, spy, journalist, recusant-hunter, pamphleteer, playwright, pageant-poet, antiquary, translator, citizen, and draper'. His activities as a Government agent between 1584 and 1592 in hunting down Martinists and recusants make it unlikely, in Miss Byrne's opinion, that during this period Munday wrote the thirteen pages of the manuscript of the play *Sir Thomas More* which are in his hand. The 'astute pursuivant' would not have taken the risk of coming up against the Censor by dealing with 'matters even faintly and remotely political or topical'. On the evidence of handwriting, and of apparently topical references in the insurrection scene to the prentice riots of June 1595, and on f. 13^b to the scouring of Moore-ditch in 1595 (first noted by Mr. Percy Simpson), Miss Byrne suggests 1595-6 as the probable date for *Sir Thomas More*.

Apart, however, from controversial questions of authorship or date, Miss Byrne's paper advances materially the study of Munday's literary activities, not only as playwright but as novelist in *Zeluuto* and as autobiographer in *Englishe-Romayne Life*. As she is pre-

⁴ *Anthony Munday and his Books*, by M. St. Clare Byrne (*Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, i, no. 4, pp. 225-56, March 1921).

⁵ Quoted, in error, as *Modern Language Association* in *The Year's Work*, 1919-20, p. 85.

paring an edition of *John a Kent and John a Cumber* from the autograph MS., now in the possession of Mr. Quaritch, for the Malone Society, it is satisfactory to know that further light upon Munday's work may be forthcoming from her researches.

In his article *The 1604 Text of Marlowe's Doctor Faustus*,⁶ Mr. Percy Simpson has made an important contribution to one of the most difficult textual problems in Elizabethan dramatic literature. He examines a number of passages as printed in the 1604 quarto by Valentine Simmes for Thomas Bushell, and shows conclusively from inconsistencies and confusion both in the text and in the stage-directions that there is deep-seated corruption. His view is that an interpolator got early to work on the play, and that 'the manager kept pace with the interpolator by ripping pages out of the manuscript and destroying them. . . . The result was a piece of patchwork in which, more and more, prose supplanted verse and comedy made inroads into a tragic theme.'

But the question is complicated by another consideration, to which Mr. Simpson refers, but to which he does not attach, as the present writer thinks, its full significance. In a valuable section of his article he shows that the 1616 quarto of *Doctor Faustus* contains passages omitted in the 1604 quarto which must have belonged to the original text. Except for a few lines these so-called 'additions' are relegated by Mr. Tucker-Brooke in his edition of Marlowe to an appendix. He states that all the changes in the later text are sufficiently accounted for by Henslowe's memorandum of the payment of £4 on 22nd November 1602 to William Birde and Samuel Rowley 'for their adicyones in doctor foste's'.

Mr. Simpson proves beyond all doubt that this is a short-sighted view, and that in a certain number of passages the later text retains the original reading. But there is something more to be said. The present writer, when editing in 1908 *The Taming of a Shrew*, had to examine closely the imitations in that play of passages in *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus*. He found that two of the plagiarisms from *Doctor Faustus* were closer to the 1616 than to the 1604 text, and that another was represented only in the

⁶ *The 1604 Text of Marlowe's 'Doctor Faustus,'* by Percy Simpson. In *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, vii, collected by John Bailey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.

later version. As *The Taming of a Shrew* was published first in 1594, and was probably written about 1590, it follows that the passages imitated must have been in *Doctor Faustus* as originally acted. One of them, it is to be noted, is the opening of the prose dialogue between Wagner and the Clown which is the first of Mr. Tucker-Brooke's appendices.

With this confirmation from an external source of Mr. Simpson's view of the merits of the 1616 text, founded on internal evidence, it may be suggested that the whole argument should be pushed further. We have been learning of late in Shakespearian criticism to go behind the printed texts to the author's 'papers'. Let us do the same with Marlowe. If a new text of *Doctor Faustus* was issued in 1616, widely different from that printed in 1604, 1609, and 1611, it was because a manuscript, or possibly a stray copy of a sixteenth-century printed edition, closer to the original playhouse version, had come into the publisher's hands. As the 1616 quarto was issued by John Wright, who had acquired the copyright from Bushell, and who had published the quartos of 1609 and 1611, it was evidently intended to supersede them. It ought in future to be taken as the basis of editions of *Doctor Faustus*, and the 1604 quarto, with whose imperfections Mr. Simpson has so faithfully dealt, should be looked upon as only a secondary authority.

While Mr. Simpson has been putting in a plea for the 1616 text of *Doctor Faustus*, the writer of a German monograph, Margarete Thimme, has been a more whole-hearted champion of a still later Marlowe issue, the 1633 quarto of *The Jew of Malta*.⁷ She takes the view that when Thomas Heywood in his epistle dedicatory speaks of the play as being 'newly brought to the Presse', he means that it is being republished; and she concludes that the 1633 quarto is based upon the 1594 edition of the play entered for publication by Nicholas Linge and Thomas Millington, of which no copy has survived. However this may be, there is force in her contention that so able and experienced a man of the theatre as Heywood would not have edited and provided with prologues and epilogues a corrupt edition of a play which in its own age was 'thought

⁷ Marlowe's '*Jew of Malta*': *Stil- und Echtheitsfragen*, von Margarete Thimme (*Studien zur englischen Philologie*, ed. Lorenz Morsbach, lxi). Max Niemeyer, Halle a. S. 1921. xi+47 pp.

second unto none'. From a detailed examination of the metre, diction, and syntax in the five acts she comes to the conclusion that they are uniform throughout, and that they are consistent with Marlowe's authorship of the whole play. Fräulein Thimme has done a useful piece of work, though the problem is one that cannot be decided only on the formal evidences with which her monograph deals.

An important addition to the documentary materials bearing on Marlowe's career has been made by Mr. Ford K. Brown, and communicated to *The Times Literary Supplement*.⁸ Mr. Brown, a Rhodes Scholar resident at Exeter College, Oxford, found that Harleian MS. 6848, f. 154, though unsigned and unendorsed, was in the same hand as Harleian 6849, ff. 218-19, the letter by Thomas Kyd to Sir John Puckering, discovered by the present writer in 1899 and reproduced in facsimile in *The Works of Thomas Kyd*. Harleian 6848, f. 154 is without doubt another letter from Kyd to Puckering. It contains charges against Marlowe of 'monstruous opinions' similar to those which are rehearsed in the notorious 'note' of the informer Richard Baines. It also refers to his 'other rashnes in attempting soden pryvie iniuries to men', and concludes with the remarkable statement: 'He wold p(er)swade wth men of quallitie to goe unto the K[ing] of *Scotts* . . . where if he had liud he told me when I sawe him last he meant to be.'

In connexion with the question of Marlowe's 'Atheism', on which the new Kyd letter gives fresh details, Miss Ethel Seaton has pointed out in *The Times Literary Supplement*⁹ that the defiant and challenging prayer uttered by the Turk Orcanes to the Christians' God in *Tamburlaine*, Part II, Act II, iii. 2893-2921, is not an invention of the dramatist, but has a striking resemblance to a passage in Bonfinius, *Rerum Ungaricarum*, Dec. III, Lib. vi, where the defeat of the treaty-breaking Christians by the Turks at the battle of Varna in 1444 is described.

⁸ *Marlowe and Kyd*. A letter from Ford K. Brown in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 2nd June 1921. See further a letter on the same subject from F. S. Boas, *ibid.*, 30th June 1921.

⁹ *Marlowe and his Authorities*. A letter from Ethel Seaton in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 16th June 1921.

The Malone Society has issued a reprint, prepared by Mr. A. E. H. Swaen, with the assistance of the General Editor, Dr. W. W. Greg, of Robert Greene's *The Scottish History of James the Fourth*.¹⁰ In the preparation of the reprint use has been made of two of the four known copies of the 1598 quarto, that in the British Museum, which wants leaf A 4, and the Dyce copy at South Kensington, which contains this leaf. The reprint contains a list of doubtful and irregular readings, exclusive of those recorded by previous editors, and a list of characters, with notes on some of the names prefixed to speeches or used in stage-directions.

In the *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, December 1920, Dr. W. W. Greg announced the discovery of a copy of a hitherto unsuspected first edition of Ben Jonson's *Every Man out of his Humour*.¹¹ Two editions of the play, dated 1600, one printed for William Holme and the other for Nicholas Linge, have been previously known. But a copy bought by the British Museum in 1908, bearing Holme's imprint and dated 1600, has been identified by Dr. Greg as belonging to an edition earlier than either of these. It has the collation A-R instead of A-O only, and the title-page differs from that of the other Holme issue, of which there are copies in the Bodleian and Dyce libraries, by having an oblong ornament instead of the device of the printer, Peter Short. By a comparison of the Museum quarto with the Bodley-Dyce quarto Dr. Greg gives conclusive bibliographical proof of the priority of the former.

The Museum copy is a poor one, and among other defects lacks leaves R 3-4 at the end. It is fortunate, therefore, that since Dr. Greg's article appeared, two better copies have been reported in the United States, one in the library of Mr. H. E. Huntington and the other in the Boston Public Library. The Malone Society reprint of Holme's first edition of the play¹² has been prepared by Mr. F. P. Wilson and Dr. Greg from the Museum copy supple-

¹⁰ *The Scottish History of James the Fourth, 1598*. The Malone Society Reprints, 1921. pp. xi + A-K in fours.

¹¹ *The First Edition of Ben Jonson's 'Every Man out of his Humour'*, by W. W. Greg (*Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, i, no. 3, pp. 153-60, Dec. 1920).

¹² *Every Man out of his Humour, 1600*. The Malone Society Reprints, 1920 (issued in 1921). pp. viii + A-R in fours.

mented by photographs from the Boston copy of all those pages which are in any way defective. The reprint includes collotype reproductions of the title-pages of both of Holme's editions and of 'Linge's quarto.

Another Jonsonian novelty is what appears to be a first draft of the Preludium to the Epode included in *The Forrest*. It consists of sixteen lines, printed by Mr. Thorn-Drury from a seventeenth-century manuscript in *A Little Ark*.¹³ The two versions are entirely different except in the last line and a half, where there is only a slight variation. The text in *The Forrest* reads:

Now my thought takes wing
And now an *Epode* to deepe eares I sing

and in the manuscript:

Now our Muse takes winge
And now an Epode to deepe eares wee singe

In *Modern Language Notes* (March 1921) Mr. W. P. Mustard adds some supplementary notes to those contained in Dr. Lynn Harris's edition of Jonson's *Catiline* (Yale Studies in English, 1916). He shows *inter alia* that the Consul's speech (III. 1-50) is closely modelled on passages in Cicero's Oration on the second Agrarian law.

In the February number Mr. Alwin Thaler points out that Richard Brome, whom Ben Jonson mentions in the Induction to *Bartholomew Fair* as his 'man' and his 'servant', is probably the Richard Brome included among the Queen of Bohemia's players in a royal warrant of 30th June 1628. He passed his apprenticeship on the stage, and it was in this sense that Jonson called him servant.

In the June number Mr. Thaler calls attention to the light thrown by the *Preludium* to Thomas Goffe's *Careless Shepherdess*, acted at the Salisbury Court Theatre in 1629, on the rates of admission to playhouses, the competition of amateur dramatists with professionals, and other aspects of theatrical history.

In *A Little Ark*, mentioned above, Mr. Thorn-Drury has had printed from manuscript thirty lines by 'Henerie Parker', addressed 'To his hono^r frend Mr Phillip Massinger, having not had that

¹³ *A Little Ark*. Containing sundry pieces of seventeenth-century verse, collected and edited by G. Thorn-Drury. London: P. J. and A. E. Dobell, 1921. viii + 57 pp. 7s. 6d. net.

just applause for one of his playes wch was due to him.' The lines begin :

Canst thou be troubled at the hissing croude ?

tush : let them stretch theire neckes, and hisse as lowde :

At that wch doth transcend theire valuacon,

as that wch is belowe, theire estimacon.

The piece evidently refers to the failure of one of the two plays whose ill fortune was lamented by Massinger himself in the prologue to *The Guardian* (1633) :

After twice putting forth to sea, his fame

Shipwreck'd in either, and his once-known name

In two years silence buried.

The plays were probably *The Emperor of the East* and *Believe as You List*, belonging to 1631.

Early in 1633 there had been privately performed before Charles I by the Queen and Ladies of Honour *The Shepheards Paradise*, by Walter Montague. Hence the severity of the sentence on William Prynne, who, in the table of contents of his *Histriomastix*, had spoken disparagingly of women actors. Montague's pastoral was published in 1659, but a folio manuscript of it is extant, from which Mr. Thorn-Drury has printed in *A Little Ark* a hitherto unknown prologue and songs between the acts. In the prologue, which takes the form of a dialogue between Diana and Apollo, Montague pays a deftly-turned compliment to the Queen. Apollo declares that

all knowing Iove

Would have stole down arm'd wth the God of Love,

But Iuno iealous, wch more reason now

Their e're before, would not this stealth allow ;

And Diana responds :

Iuno did well, her husband would have seene

A Paradise contain'd in such a Queene :

He might have own'd this as his proper place

Alluding Heaven was truly in her face.

The so-called 'Songs' are, as Mr. Thorn-Drury says, 'by way of being comments on the text' of the play, and are written in rhymed couplets. They run smoothly enough, and do not support the charge made by a contemporary that 'th' English of Watt Montague' is 'more hard then French'.

The most important contribution to the study of the Elizabethan drama during the past year is the first volume of the edition of Sir William Alexander's *Poetical Works*¹⁴ by Professors L. E. Kastner and H. B. Charlton. This volume, containing the dramatic works, has been issued separately on the sufficient ground 'that the material did in fact constitute a volume with a unity and completeness of its own; and that it was that section of his poems to which the author himself attached most importance'. Volume II, containing the rest of Alexander's compositions in verse, will follow at an early date.

The editors have reprinted the text of *The Monarchicke Tragedies* (*Cresus*, *Darius*, *The Alexandraean*, *Julius Caesar*) in the last version issued during the author's lifetime, that of the *Recreations with the Muses* (1637). 'In their *apparatus criticus* they give all the variants in the earlier editions from *Darius* published alone in 1603 to the 1616 edition of the four tragedies. As the 1603 *Darius* differs in almost every line from the final version it is printed in full.

The editors feel it necessary to justify such elaborate treatment of writings for which they do not claim 'great aesthetic merit'. They make out an excellent case on various grounds. Alexander's poetry is 'the first literary counterpart of the political union of the crowns of England and Scotland, the embodiment of an Anglo-Scottish confederacy in letters. But in this confederacy England established herself as the predominant partner, and Alexander showed an increasing eagerness to purge away the outward marks of his Northern ancestry'. This resulted, in the oft-repeated revisions of his works, in 'a progressive weeding out from his diction of everything smacking of the archaic, the affected, the pedantic, and particularly of the provincial, whether in vocabulary, syntax, or pronunciation'. There could not be a more illuminating example of the value of linguistic investigation, not merely to the philologist but to the student of literature, than the spectacle of this remorseless elimination by Alexander of the Scottish element

¹⁴ *The Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling*, ed. by L. E. Kastner, M.A., and H. B. Charlton, M.A. Volume the First. The Dramatic Works. With an Introductory Essay on the Growth of the Senecan Tradition in Renaissance Tragedy. Manchester: at the University Press. Longmans, Green & Co., 1921. cccix+482 pp. 28s. net.

in his style. By means of their textual apparatus, and the additional elucidation furnished in their notes, the editors enable us to follow the process in detail. And the irony of it is that all the while Alexander is cutting his own throat. For it is just the dialect words and forms and the archaisms that break up the glossy surface of his style and do something to relieve its monotony. Similarly he robs his versification of any elements of variety by regularizing the stress arrangement, substituting end-stopped for run-on lines, and getting rid of double rhymes.

But if linguistically Alexander's plays are a document on the relations of Scottish and English idiom, they have something of cosmopolitan significance in the sphere of dramatic art. It is to elucidate this that the editors have included in the volume a long and elaborately documented introductory essay on 'the growth of the Senecan tradition in Renaissance tragedy'. The essay should be read in full by every student of Renaissance literature; it is a masterly monograph which might well be issued separately. Here it is possible to mention only the points which bear upon Alexander's work. The contrasted development of the Senecan tradition in Italy and France is traced at length, and is summed up thus: 'France makes Seneca more academic than he was, Italy develops his theatrical leanings. The French are mainly concerned with literary form and moral content, the Italians with spectacular show and melodramatic effect. In France action is almost dispensed with, stirring incident is banned, dialogue becomes monologue, *sententiae* are expanded to sermons, language acquires the perpetual gloss of rhetoric—in short a French Senecan drama is drama in little but name.'

Professors Kastner and Charlton seek to show that 'the main march of the English Seneca was along the road which the Italians had first struck out', but that he went much further on this common track than the Italians, and that 'by so doing he impelled a relatively isolated group to seek more classical paths with France for guide'. The 'main march' of this English Seneca, incorporating more and more of popular elements, is traced successively through the translators of the *Tenne Tragedies* (1581), the Senecan dramatists of the Inns of Court, professional playwrights of the Kyd School, University dramatists like Gager, and finally Ben Jonson, who attempted in vain 'the reformation of the people's Seneca

without destroying his popularity'. The section on Jonson is the most penetrating exposition that has hitherto appeared of his exact place in the Senecan Movement and in theatrical cross-currents generally.

Contrasted with these various phases of the popular Senecan movement on Italian lines is the work of 'a narrow coterie of poets' bound together for the most part by personal ties, who translated French Seneca or wrote plays on his model not for the theatre but for the study. Kyd as translator of Garnier's *Cornélie* belongs to this as well as to the Italianate group. The other leading members are the Countess of Pembroke, Daniel, Fulke Greville, and Sir William Alexander. One and all they choose their subjects from classical history, not to thrill spectators or readers, in Greville's words, 'with variety and unexpected encounters', but to enrich memory and judgement with a long-drawn scheme of sententious moralizing of which the Chorus becomes the chief mouthpiece. It is because Alexander's *Monarchike Tragedies*, written throughout (save for the choric parts) in the alternately rhyming decasyllables, which were the favourite metre of the group, illustrate on the widest scale the characteristics of French Seneca in Britain that they have the interest attaching to the most representative example of any literary type. It is this that justifies a monumental publication that does honour to the two editors, to the Manchester University Press, and to the Scottish Text Society which has lent its co-operation.

A play which hitherto had remained in manuscript is *The Welsh Ambassador*, now printed for the Malone Society, and edited by Professor H. Littledale and Dr. W. W. Greg.¹⁵ The MS., which was formerly in the Phillipps collection, is now in the Cardiff Public Library. It consists of nineteen folio leaves, and has suffered from damp, 'the lower margin of each leaf being more or less decayed, and a portion of the text lost on almost every page'. It is probably in the hand not of the author but of a professional scribe, who appears to have added later the marginal warnings to the actors—a proof that the play was prepared for the stage, and may even have belonged to the small extant group of prompt copies.

¹⁵ *The Welsh Ambassador*. The Malone Society Reprints, 1920 (issued in 1921). viii+71 pp.

The Welsh Ambassador, which numbers 231Q lines, seems from a reference in l. 2162 to have been written in or about 1623. The name of the author is unknown. It is one of the few seventeenth-century plays dealing, at least nominally, with an episode from the Anglo-Saxon period. Its central figure is Athelstane, not as hero and lawgiver, but as a royal light o' love. He is under a contract to marry Armante, daughter of the Duke of Colchester, who has borne him a son. But his fancy has now veered to Carintha, wife of Penda, the Duke of Cornewall's son. To secure her as his bride he has ordered one of his captains, Voltimar, to stab Penda during a battle on French soil. Voltimar only feigns compliance, and Penda returns to court in disguise with the King's two brothers, Eldred and Edmond, who are both reported slain. Penda assumes the part of an ambassador from the Welsh King Howell, who sends tribute to Athelstane, while Eldred figures as his compatriot and follower, and Edmond as his Irish footman. The King tries to bring about a match between Armante and the 'ambassador' till 'the comedy of Welsh disguises' is revealed, Penda is reunited to his wife, and Athelstane makes Armante his queen.

The most interesting feature of the play consists in the Welsh and Irish dialects spoken by the 'ambassador' and his men, which will repay fuller annotation than is possible in a Malone Society reprint. A Clown, with an ambition to be a Chronicler, supplies an element of very tedious fooling.

Another manuscript play has been edited from British Museum Egerton MS. 1994 by Professor Schoell, of Chicago. It is the anonymous drama which A. H. Bullen printed in *A Collection of Old English Plays*, vol. iii (1884), under the title of *The Distracted Emperor*, but which the present editor calls simply and preferably *Charlemagne*.¹⁶ In addition to the text Professor Schoell supplies an introduction, notes, an account of the sources, and an *appendice critique*, all of which are in French.

His object in re-editing the play is twofold. 'In the first place he wishes to correct imperfections in the text as printed by Bullen,

¹⁶ *Charlemagne (The Distracted Emperor)*, Drame Élisabéthain Anonyme. Édition Critique avec Introduction et Notes par Franck L. Schoell, Professeur à l'Université de Chicago. Princeton: Princeton University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1920. 157 pp. 12s. 6d. net.

who 'a mal lu certains mots, modifié constamment l'orthographe originale, tout en laissant entendre qu'il la respectait, négligé quelques indications scéniques'. Professor Schoell's variations from the text of his predecessors, other than purely orthographical, are given in his *appendice critique*, and we are indebted to him for restoring in a number of cases the original reading. He has also given a few stage directions omitted by Bullen. But he has not noticed that some of these, e.g. *Hoboyes*, after I. i. 155, are not in the hand of the original scribe, but have been added later, and are *pro tanto* evidence that the MS. was used as a prompt copy.

Professor Schoell, however, frankly states that in spite of his emendations his edition does not present 'aucune modification vraiment essentielle au texte même de M. Bullen'. His principal aim is to prove that *Charlemagne* was written by George Chapman. Bullen, after one or two other guesses, had himself stated his impression 'that Chapman had the chief hand' in the play, but did not work the matter out in detail. This Professor Schoell does at length in the introduction and the notes. In the former he gives rather more weight than is due to the fact that *Charlemagne* is, as he puts it, a *chronique historique* based like *Bussy* and *Byron* on a French subject. It is a far cry from the court of Charlemagne to that of Henry III and Henry IV of France. Professor Schoell is on firmer ground when he compares the character-drawing in the play with that in Chapman's undoubted works, and when he finds analogies between them and *Charlemagne* in thought, phrasing, and rhythm. These analogies are copiously illustrated in the notes, and their cumulative effect is undeniably striking. Professor Schoell has considerably strengthened the case for Chapman's authorship, but there are questions concerned with the *provenance* and history of the manuscript which need further discussion. In any event this scholarly and comely edition of the play is welcome.

The Captives ; or, The Lost Recovered, another of the plays printed by Bullen from Egerton MS. 1994, in *A Collection of Old English Plays*, vol. iv (1885), has been re-edited by an American scholar, Professor A. C. Judson.¹⁷ The volume, which has an attractive

¹⁷ *The Captives ; or, The Lost Recovered*. Written by Thomas Heywood. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by Alexander Corbin Judson, Associate Professor of English in the University of Texas. New

format, is the first work published under the auspices of the Elizabethan Club of Yale College, in memory of Francis Bergen, a graduate, who was accidentally killed in May 1917, during his period of military training, and whose father has instituted at Yale 'the Francis Bergen Lectures' on recent English Literature and Drama, and recent advances and achievements in Science. Though the MS. has no title, its identification by Bullen with the 'new Play, called *The Captive* ; or, *the Lost Recovered* : written by Hayward' [i.e. Thomas Heywood] mentioned by Sir Henry Herbert in his Office-Book, 3rd September 1624, has been generally accepted by scholars.

Professor Judson has collated Bullen's edition with rotographs of the manuscript ; he has thus been able to include several passages which Bullen found himself unable to read, and has also altered his readings at a number of points. All important departures from the text in the Bullen edition have been indicated in the foot-notes. As the handwriting of the manuscript is exceptionally difficult, Professor Judson has done valuable service by his emendations, and has made available a more correct text. But, like Professor Schoell in his edition of *Charlemagne*, he has not always distinguished the stage-directions, which are numerous, in the original script from those added by the prompter.

Professor Judson, from an examination of some of the corrections in the text, makes out a strong case for its being autograph. This claim is supported by the fact that the following piece in MS. Egerton 1994, *Calisto*, which is a canto of episodes from Heywood's *Golden Age* and *Silver Age*, is in the same hand. It is hard to think of any one employing an amanuensis with such a villainous 'fist'.

The main part of the 'Introduction' deals with Heywood's skilful management of his sources, the *Rudens* of Plautus and a *novella* of Masuccio of Salerno. The 'Notes' include a number of illustrative quotations from both sources, and a Glossary and Bibliography complete an excellent edition.

Another play which on internal evidence has been claimed for Heywood, *Appius and Virginia*, is discussed in *The Modern Haven*: Yale University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1921. 180 pp. 12s. 6d. net.

Language Review, by Mr. A. M. Clark.¹⁸ He elaborates the argument of Rupert Brooke in *John Webster and the Elizabethan Drama* that *Appius and Virginia*, though published under Webster's name in 1654 and 1659, was written by Heywood, and that Webster at most 'shortened and made more dramatic the very beginning of the play, and heightened, or even rewrote, the trial scene (iv. i)'. His only criticism is that he traces Webster's hand 'more frequently but not more integrally than in these two scenes'. In support of the attribution to Heywood he examines the construction of the play, the character-drawing, the style, metre and vocabulary, and concludes that *Appius and Virginia* was a companion piece to Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*, afterwards hastily revised and cut about by Webster.

But what Webster thus loses on the roundabouts he pulls up on the swings, if we accept Mr. Dugdale Sykes' thesis¹⁹ that the comedy *Anything for a Quiet Life*, published as Middleton's in 1662, is largely the work of the more powerful dramatist. Mr. Sykes bases his claim on 'clear traces of [Webster's] style and vocabulary as well as numerous passages bearing a close resemblance to passages in his acknowledged plays'. He also instances borrowings from the *Arcadia*, and from Overbury's *Characters* (1615 edition), which may be paralleled in *The Duchess of Malfi* and *The Devil's Law Case*.

In another article²⁰ Mr. Sykes supports the view that *The Queen, or the Excellency of her Sex*, printed anonymously in 1658, is from the pen of John Ford. Professor Bang, of Louvain, who reprinted the play in 1906, ascribed it to Ford, and his verdict has been endorsed by Mr. Stuart P. Sherman in *Modern Language Notes*, vol. xxiii. By a comparison of the vocabulary and phraseology of *The Queen* with those of Ford's undoubted plays, Mr. Sykes places his authorship beyond reasonable question, though he admits that

¹⁸ *The Authorship of 'Appius and Virginia'*, by Arthur M. Clark (*The Modern Language Review*, xvi. i, January 1921).

¹⁹ *A Webster-Middleton Play: 'Anything for a Quiet Life'*, by H. Dugdale Sykes (*Notes & Queries*, 3, 10, 17 September 1921).

²⁰ *Ford's Posthumous Play, 'The Queen'* (*Notes & Queries*, 11th and 18th December 1920).

the piece exhibits 'scarcely a trace of the tragic power and psychological insight' of his greater dramas.

By the use of kindred methods he attempts to find Field's hand in parts of some of the plays in the Beaumont and Fletcher folios.²¹ These are the two first 'Triumphs' of *Four Plays in One*, Act III and IV of *The Queen of Corinth* and Acts I and V of *The Knight of Malta*. The parallels in phrase and imagery that he finds between them and Field's undoubted plays are very striking.

A far less plausible attempt is made¹ by Mr. William Wells to fix the authorship of another play, *The Birth of Merlin*, assigned by its publisher in 1662 to Shakespeare and Rowley.²² There is no sign of Shakespeare's hand in the piece. Middleton and Dekker are among those who have been suggested as Rowley's real collaborators. Mr. Wells makes the novel claim that Beaumont and Fletcher were the chief authors of the play. He bases his view on resemblances between the main plot of *The Birth of Merlin* and that of *Cupid's Revenge*, both derived from Sidney's *Arcadia*, and on parallelisms of phrase. He thinks that there was a play—'X'—which formed the basis of both pieces. The argument is laboured and does not carry conviction.

In *The Riddle of 'Philaster'*²³ Mr. W. J. Lawrence sets forth a new theory of the relation of Quarto 1 of the play to the later Quartos. He rejects the view 'that *Philaster* was originally produced by the King's Men, c. 1608, and that the variants of Quarto 1 represent some unexplainable sophistication of the true Beaumont and Fletcher text', due to a scribe in the audience. It is taken, in his opinion, from a careless transcript of a genuine playhouse copy. His theory is 'that *Philaster* was originally written by Fletcher for some company of boy-players with the help of some journeyman playwright, and that on the collapse of the company the play was purchased by the King's Men, and handed over to Beaumont for revision'.

²¹ *Nathaniel Field's Work in the 'Beaumont and Fletcher' Plays (Notes & Queries*, 19th, 26th Feb.; 5th, 12th March 1921).

²² *The Birth of Merlin*, by William Wells (*Modern Language Review*, xvi, 2nd April 1921).

²³ *The Riddle of 'Philaster'*, by W. J. Lawrence (*The Times Literary Supplement*, 17th November 1921).

These views are mainly based on the occurrence in Quarto 1 of 'technical stage-directions beyond the powers of any layman of the shorthand writing order to add. Not only that, but some of these directions distinctly convey that the play had originally been produced at a private theatre by some company of boy-players before the close of 1609'. Mr. Lawrence contends that in the public theatres no stage monarch would have appeared unheralded by trumpets, but that in the less roomy private theatres cornets were substituted for the louder instruments. As there is no mention of trumpets in Quarto 1 on the two occasions where the King is heralded, he holds that the piece must have been written originally for boy-players, and that it did not pass into the possession of the King's Men till 1613, when Beaumont altered and improved the *dénouement*. Mr. Lawrence's speculations are ingenious, but they rest upon a slender and uncertain basis.

In a later article²⁴ Mr. Lawrence deals with the presentation of 'the first independent theatre masque, otherwise Middleton and Rowley's *The World Tos't at Tennis*'. He gives reasons for his view that the masque, though 'prepar'd for his Maiesties Entertainment at Denmarke House', was, nevertheless, not performed at Court, and calls attention to the fact that the entry of the piece on the Stationers' Register, 4th July 1620, describes it as 'acted at the Princes Armes by the Prince his higghnes seruantes'. It is surprising to find a performance at an inn by a London professional company at so late a date. Neither this masque, nor *The Sun's Darling*, by Ford and Dekker, given at the Phoenix in March 1624, appear to have been produced in full court form. Nabbes' *Microcosmus* (printed 1637) may have been the first masque presented in a theatre with movable scenery.

Two important articles in *Studies in Philology* show that even during the heyday of Puritan domination, 1642-60, the activities of the theatre were less completely suppressed than has been generally believed. In *Notes on Puritanism and the Stage* (April 1921) Mr. Thornton S. Graves, after quoting a number of un-

²⁴ *Early Substantive Masques* (*The Times Literary Supplement*, 8th December 1921).

familiar censures of plays and players by early Stuart writers, reprints from John Rowe's *Tragi-Comoedia* (1658) the *Brief Narrative of the Play Acted at Witney the third of February, 1652*. This 'Brief Narrative' tells with lively detail how, while a number of countrymen, who had already performed in other Oxfordshire villages, were acting *Mucedorus* in a crowded chamber in the White Hart Inn, the floor gave way, and many of the spectators were killed or hurt. In this event Rowe discovers 'the Wonderfull hand of God', but his narrative is an unwilling testimony to the popularity of acting in rural England during the Commonwealth. Mr. Graves further cites pleas for the theatre, and attacks on its enemies, from many works issued between 1649 and 1660.

Mr. Hyder E. Rollins in the same periodical (July 1921) in *A Contribution to the History of the English Commonwealth Drama*, goes for his material to 'the huge collection of news-books, pamphlets, and single sheets amassed during the years 1640-60 by the London printer George Thomason', and now preserved in the British Museum. Though he was concerned in his researches with the history of the ballad rather than of the drama, he has amassed a number of new facts which no student of the seventeenth-century stage can neglect. He gives accounts from the contemporary news-sheets of surreptitious performances at the Fortune, Red Bull, Salisbury Court, and Cockpit theatres, and of hitherto unrecorded raids by soldiers to stop them, especially after the drastic anti-stage ordinance of 9th February 1647/8. Specially interesting are the extracts from *Mercurius Pragmaticus* and *The Man in the Moon* concerning the raid on a play at the Red Bull on 21st January 1649/50; and from *The Public Intelligencer*, 14th-21st January 1656, telling how the Newcastle Justices punished players. In another news-sheet Mr. Rollins has discovered the remarkable fact that the actors at Salisbury Court dared to advertise a performance on 6th October 1647, of Beaumont and Fletcher's *A King and No King*, which was naturally stopped by the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs. A later raid on the Red Bull on 14th September 1655 and the levy of gages in lieu of a fine of five shillings on the women in the audience are amusingly described in *The Weekly Intelligencer*, and in one of the ballads in *Sportive Wit* (1656), which also includes a lampoon on Davenant, 'How *Daphne* payes his Debts', in which

he asserts his ⁵resolve to become Master of the Revels, and to present

‘Masques

Made à la mode de France’

at Potheccaries Hall. But the time was at hand when it would no longer be necessary to use ‘masque’ by way of subterfuge for stage-play, and when performances could again take place without danger of raids by the military authorities.

VIII

THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD POETRY AND PROSE

[By H. J. C. GRIERSON AND ARTHUR MELVILLE CLARK]

SPENSER and his circle figure less prominently in the publications of 1921 than of 1920, but the historical allusions in and behind his allegorical poetry continue to stimulate the activity of American scholars. Miss A. R. Snell (*Modern Language Notes*, xxxvi, 182-3) returns to the much debated allegory of *Muipotmos*, and gives further reasons for identifying Clarion with Spenser himself in opposition to suggestions that he is Raleigh. Attempts to solve the riddle of this poem must fail if their authors ignore the important and elaborate genealogy of the Spider.

The Virtue of Temperance in the Faerie Queene (*Studies in Philology*, July 1921) is an attempt by Mr. Frederick Morgan Padelford to show by a detailed analysis how closely Spenser in his Second Book keeps to the Aristotelian doctrine. There is nothing really new in it, except perhaps the ingenious discoveries of parallels to the *Ethics*: it performs for the Legend of Temperance very much what Ruskin did for the Legend of Holiness in an appendix to *The Stones of Venice*.

Messrs. R. G. Whigam and O. F. Emerson (*Sonnet Structure in Sidney's 'Astrophel and Stella'*: *Studies in Philology*, July 1921), believing that 'too little attention has been paid to the varied and interesting forms used by Sidney', have amply made up for this neglect by counting the syllables and tabulating the rhyme schemes, &c. of the sonnets in the *Astrophel* sequence and in Sidney's miscellaneous poetry.

Mrs. Stopes's article (*Modern Language Review*, July 1921) on Thomas Edwards, the obscure author of the two Ovidian paraphrases, *Cephalus and Procris* and *Narcissus*, is a most ingenious attempt to produce a biographical sketch from the merest hints and chance phrases. Yet one does feel that she almost establishes the fact that Thomas was the younger brother of the author of *Palamon and Arcite*, and a gentleman at court in the nineties of the sixteenth century: there is nothing in the evidence presented to compel our acquiescence, but it is sufficiently plausible to provoke, as Mrs. Stopes hopes, others whose notes may cover the same ground, to add their findings to her own. One can hardly accept, however, the suggestion that the Aetion of *Colin Clout's come home again* is Edwards: his verse is rather shambling and his rhymes too rude to deserve even from Spenser, whom Thomas Edwards seems to have regarded as his master, such generous admiration. On the other hand, Mrs. Stopes has a good case in identifying the 'Edwards' who wrote two poems in a Bodleian MS. with Thomas. One is left with the impression that more should be known of this man, rather, however, on account of his allusions to Shakespeare, Spenser, Marlowe, Daniel, and others, than because of his poetic qualities.

Milton has been the subject of much critical investigation by English, American, and Continental scholars during 1921. The interest in his thought and character, in the light thrown on his poems by a study of *De Doctrina Christiana* (so long neglected from this point of view), and the prose pamphlets, has grown steadily of late years. The present writer contributed a short study of Milton's relation to orthodox Protestant theology to Hastings' *Dictionary of Theology* (vol. viii, 1915) and M. Denis Saurat's much more exhaustive work was treated in Volume I of *The Year's Work*. He has supplemented this by an article in the *Revue Germanique* (1921) on *Les Sources anglaises de la Pensée de Milton* and a pamphlet on *Milton et le Zohar* (1921-2). In the first he shows the close affinity between Milton's thought regarding the materiality of the soul and its participation in the death of the body—to be recreated at the Resurrection—with the thoughts and arguments of the book *Man's Mortality*, to which Masson drew attention. This work expresses the views of a group of

advanced thinkers, referred to in Edwards' *Gangraena*, the names of three of whom are known. Dr. Saurat conjectures that Milton knew the first edition 1643-4, was in sympathy with the authors, and probably influenced the changes in expression and still more in tone—which becomes more religious, if no more orthodox—of the edition of 1655, and is responsible for the increase in the number of citations from the Fathers. In the pamphlet Dr. Saurat goes on to show that much of Milton's thought may be traced to a study of the *Zohar*, the doctrines of the Cabbala. A writer in *Englische Studien*, January 1920, dealt with the indebtedness of Blake to the same source for some of his mythology. Milton, Saurat points out, has neglected the mythology; for him the *Zohar* was 'une mine d'idées philosophiques'. The discovery has qualified Saurat's regard for 'l'originalité de Milton comme penseur' but increased the importance of Milton as in his time 'le représentant de l'esprit moderne', and his interest as a channel for ideas which reached Blake. But Blake died two years after the discovery of the *De Doctrina*.

The fresh interest in the thought and character of Milton is not confined to France. The Swedish scholar S. B. Liljegren's *Studies in Milton*,¹ which has come to hand only since this survey was begun, and Mutschmann's *Der andere Milton*,² have developed (the latter in apparently rather truculent style), in opposition to what is taken to be the English view of Milton as a Christian and Puritan poet, the thesis that he is, rather, an extreme representative of the same Renaissance type as Raleigh and Marlowe, egotistic, unscrupulous, and ultimately a Stoic rather than a Christian, his acceptance of the supernatural elements in his creed having become purely conventional or poetic. Liljegren's is a remarkable book. It is written in English, but the sentence-structure is often more German than English, especially in the more philosophical paragraphs. The most important, and largest, portion of the book deals with the trustworthiness of Milton's statements about himself, and consists in a carefully documented proof of the extreme improbability of Milton's having actually visited Galileo in Italy, so that his statement in the *Areopagitica* that he 'found and visited the famous Galileo grown old' would be an exaggeration due to a desire to magnify his own importance.

¹ Lund: Gleerup, 1918.

² Bonn: Schroeder, 1920.

Liljegren also holds that the balance of the evidence is in favour of the contention (to which Johnson refers in his *Life*) that Milton and Dugard the printer interpolated into the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική* the Pamela prayer from Sidney's *Arcadia*, the use of which Milton then flung at the dead King in such petulant and truculent terms. To the present writer the latter case seems still not quite proved; and he would demur to the inference from it, even if true, regarding Milton's character as a whole and its reflection in his work. Man is too complex an animal to be read from one or two actions, and Liljegren insufficiently stresses what is probably the chief factor—politics, especially revolutionary politics. The purest idealists have found themselves before long, unscrupulous Macchiavellians in revolutionary conditions. 'Faction seldom leaves a man honest, however it find him.' Some statements of Milton are in Liljegren's general argument unduly forced. If Milton contends that justice, as an active virtue, stands higher than the contemplative virtue truth, it is hardly fair to argue that Milton means that truth may be sacrificed to justice. Mutschmann, who underlines Liljegren's contentions and paints Milton as a non-moral egotist of the kind glorified by Nietzsche, argues that Milton served virtue only as a means to fame—Liljegren perhaps approaches this too—and gives as proof the lines:

Love virtue; she alone is free,
She can teach ye how to climb
Higher than the sphery chime.

So that Plato, whom Milton is following, when he speaks of the ascent of the soul by dialectic to the Idea of the Good is thinking of the pursuit of fame!

Liljegren and Mutschmann have been criticized; the former sympathetically but decisively by Walter Fischer in *Englische Studien*, May 1918. Liljegren's reply, and a note on his conception of Satan by Fischer, appear in the same periodical (September 1920 and January 1921). Mutschmann has been more trenchantly dealt with by Rudolf Metz (September 1920); and a discussion between these two critics runs through Vol. 55, 1921. The common assumption of all these critics that English criticism is governed by the Puritan tradition is, in view of the work of Landor, Garnett, Saintsbury, Raleigh, &c., absurd. The present

writer in the Hastings' Dictionary article concluded that 'Milton's was not an *anima naturaliter Christiana*. His was rather the soul of an ancient Stoic.' This seems to be Liljegren's view as he restates it in *Bemerkungen zur Biographie Milton's in Englische Studien*, September 1920. The question remains whether such a temperament was not combined with Christian faith in Milton. Liljegren thinks not. The present writer finds it hard to reconcile this view with the fact that Milton made the Christian doctrine of sin and redemption the subject of his three great poems.

An interesting article, and not irrelevant to this consideration, is Mr. C. A. Moore's *The Conclusion of Paradise Lost* (*Publ. of the Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, xxxvi, March 1921). In reply to a previous article by Mr. John Erskine, Mr. Moore contends that the spirit of resignation, of sorrow balanced by hope, in which *Paradise Lost* ends, is in harmony with the orthodox Christian tradition, which saw in sin and death evils indeed, but evils which made possible a higher good than human nature had otherwise attained, that Milton here is in close harmony with Du Bartas and Giles Fletcher. It is clear that the ground is being prepared on many sides for a careful restudy of Milton. Other American articles of interest are: *Detached Similes in Milton Epics* (*Modern Lang. Notes*, xxxvi, p. 34) which stresses the large part played by nature as against books in these; a note by Mr. Edward Chancey Baldwin on the 'Golden compasses' of Book vii, 225 as due to a misunderstanding of the A. V. of Prov. viii. 17 'He set a compass upon the face of the deep', and on the 'Babylonian Woe' of the Piedmont sonnet and the fifty-first chapter of Jeremiah; with other notes in the same periodical: an article *Further Interpretations of Milton* in which Mr. John A. Hines, continuing a former paper, suggests some, on the face of them, not very convincing interpretations of passages in Milton. The Fair Infant of Milton's early poem, he declares, following a statement of some old editions recorded by Newton, was a boy, despite the reference to the Boreas-Orithyia's story, and the closing lines: .

Then thou the mother of so sweet a child
Her false imagin'd loss cease to lament.

It is the 'anima' which is the subject of the poem and accounts for the feminine pronoun and allusions, while some of the last

are to males. Thus 'that sweet smiling youth' is, Mr. Hines says, Ganymede. Not more convincing is the view that the Nymphs of *Lycidas* l. 50 are not the Muses but the Nereids 'whose presence is manifested in mists and clouds'. Why the king was specially loved of Nereids or mists is no more clear than why the Druids should be their 'Old Bards'. It is the other kind of clergy whose flocks are 'swollen with wind and the rank mist they draw'.

Samson Agonistes is the subject of a paper in the *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, Sept. 1921, by Mr. Paull Franklin Baum, who controverts Johnson's well-known criticism and examines the tragedy in the light of Aristotle's definitions. As against Johnson, his main contention is that the play is not a beginning and end with no middle, no dramatic progress. The dramatic action is the awaking through successive impulses of Samson from the lethargy of despair to the perception of a service to be yet rendered to God. What the tragedy really wants is conflict. 'It moves along a straight line, sluggishly perhaps, but irresistibly—and yet too easily.' In closing Mr. Baum touches on the difficult question of the compatibility of Christian faith in providence with the tragic conception of life, and concludes that *Samson Agonistes* is not from Aristotle's point of view essentially tragic, which may be true, but is also true of more than one Greek tragedy which ends on a note not of disaster but rather of triumph, as *Oedipus Coloneus*.

Milton and the Art of War by Mr. James Holly Hanford (*Studies in Philology*, April, 1921) is a long appendix to Masson's *Life of Milton*. It is to prove, first, that Milton had a very thorough knowledge of classical and Renaissance text-books on war and tactics and of works belonging to his own age based on these: secondly, that this accomplishment was not pedantic or antiquated but was indeed the ordinary qualification of the military experts of the period: thirdly, that Milton's familiarity with these treatises was not at all exceptional, and that both this book-learning and Milton's views on the advantage of military discipline as expressed in his *Tractate on Education*, together with all the biographical facts known, do not prove that the poet was ever under arms. Mr. Hanford examines Phillips's statement that Milton was at one time about to be appointed adjutant-general in Waller's army, and

adduces evidence to show that such persons were only semi-civilian staff-officers. Some interesting passages from Milton's prose and poetry are quoted to illustrate how conversant he was with contemporary and classical strategy.

But the most interesting Milton publication of the year is Mr. John Smart's *The Sonnets of Milton*.³ This makes real additions to our knowledge in more ways than one. The *Introduction* is an important chapter in the history of the sonnet in Italy and England. Mr. Smart shows that the English form of sonnet 'was brought into existence on an Italian basis by a selection and adjustment'; and that Milton's variety of the stricter Italian form with bold *enjambement* and overflow of the octave into the sestet was neither a rebellious breach of a tradition (as Mark Pattison thought) nor an attempt to assimilate the sonnet to the construction of an Horatian ode (as Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch has argued), but a recognized Italian variety, cultivated especially by Giovanni della Casa, whose sonnets were known to Milton. Smart has also fixed the date of the Italian sonnets of Milton as prior to his visit to Italy, and identified the christian name, Emilia, of the lady addressed. Who she was is not yet clear. He has also corrected the mistake, handed on from one edition to another, of giving the name of the lady whose 'religious memory' is preserved in the fourteenth sonnet as Thomson, and shows that it is Thomason in the MS., and that she was the wife of George Thomason, the collector of Civil War pamphlets. He has gathered some detailed references to her character and tastes. He has shown with a scholarly thoroughness that the 'Lawrence, of virtuous father virtuous son' is Edward, the older son of the Lord President of the Council, not the younger Henry as Masson and others had conjectured. These are the most important, but not the only additions to our knowledge of Milton's friends and Milton's character, which Mr. Smart has brought together in this admirable volume. He accepts the order of the sonnets as that of composition. In *Modern Philology*, viii, p. 475, Jan. 1921, Mr. Hanford disputes this as regards sonnets 11 and 12, giving reasons to show that Milton himself reversed the order

³ *The Sonnets of Milton*, with Introduction and Notes. By John S. Smart, D.Litt. Glasgow: Maclehose, Jackson & Co., 1921. 195 pp. 7s. 6d. net.

of these two and shifted *The Forcers of Conscience* to the end of the sonnets in the 1673 edition. One doubt admits another, and Mr. Hanford discusses the order of the early, especially the Italian, sonnets and comes to the conclusion which Mr. Smart has also reached, the latter with fuller evidence. Though scrutinizing the transcript of Milton's MS. closely, Mr. Hanford continues to speak of Mrs. Thomson, so persistent is an error once started. In the quest of sources American scholars are unwearied. Miss O. H. Moore in *Modern Philology*, xix, Aug. 1921, traces the influence of Mantuan and Marino upon the development of the 'Imperial Council' and the rôles of Sannazaro and Tasso in this development. The pursuit of sources reminds one a little of the Scilly Islanders who lived by taking in each other's washing. No poet seems ever to say anything unless another has said it before him, and it is hard to discover where the process began.

John Donne has not hitherto received much close attention from German scholars. This deficiency is now made good by a long essay on his life and poetry in *Anglia* (June, 1920) by Philip Aronstein, whose excellent study of Ben Jonson, reprinted from *Anglia*, is known to all scholars. Aronstein's essay is based on Gosse's *Life and Letters* (1899) and the present writer's edition of the *Poems* (1912), and makes no distinct addition to our knowledge. He accepts the editor's connexion of Donne's *Metempsychosis* with the execution of Essex, which was treated with scant ceremony by critics in this country; and agrees with him in stressing the conflict in Donne's mind between the old and the new science, his consciousness of the shattering of the traditional cosmology, in the *Anniversaries*. During the war Aronstein made this the theme of a short essay in *Englische Studien* on Donne and Bacon. He recognizes the resemblance, in this acute sensibility to the movement of thought around him, of Donne to Tennyson, and indeed adds: 'Tennyson hat oft ähnliche Gedanken wie Donne. Ob er ihn gekannt hat?' Aronstein's criticism is just and excellent, in its appreciation of the various groups of poems, the analysis of his art, and the final estimate of Donne's passionate, personal, metaphysical poetry:

'So ist D. ein Ich-künstler, aber nicht ein Ich-künstler, wie etwa Byron, der sich einem schrankenlosen Subjektivismus

hingab, sich, wie Goethe von ihm sagt, im Sittlichen nicht zu begrenzen wusste, immer dunkel über sich selbst war und leidenschaftlich in den Tag hineinlebte, sondern wie Goethe selbst, von einem starken inneren Triebe beherrscht, Klarheit über sich selbst zu gewinnen, sein Ich fortzubauen und zu entwickeln im Einklange mit seiner innersten Natur, und zugleich sich äusserlich und innerlich einzufügen in die Welt, im weitesten Sinne gefasst . . . Nicht der Dichter ist bei ihm die Hauptsache, sondern das Leben.'

Several of the lesser seventeenth-century poets have been made more accessible in the course of the year. *A Neaste of Wasps*⁴ is an addition to the many collections of epigrams. Elizabethan epigrams are too often dull and coarse, and these are of the dullest and thoroughly deserve to be thus carefully reprinted in their original abominable spelling and punctuation. Two of them touch on the Somerset-Frances Howard scandal, none so poignant as that which is found anonymous in many MSS., e.g. Sir Henry Wotton's Burley MS. :

A page, a knight, a vicount, and an Earle,
In England matched to a scurvy girle.
This match was fitt for she was likewise fowre,
A wife, a witch, a murderer, and a w—e.

But the most important publication is the third volume of Saintsbury's *Caroline Poets*,⁵ containing poems of Cleveland, Henry King, Thomas Stanley, Thomas Flatman, and Nathaniel Whiting. Professor Saintsbury's enthusiasm carries him through them all, and his notes are a good finger-post to much of interest which a casual reader might easily let slip. To the reader interested in the historical point of view two qualities of these poems will be apparent. The first is the subsidence of the accent of the poet from that of song to that of a kind of quiet conversation. King is a by no means undelightfully quiet and friendly talker in verse, and the tone of Cowley's poems (not of course represented here) is not much higher than that of his prose essays. Even in the Pindariques he fails to catch

⁴ *A Neaste of Wasps Latelie found out and discovered in the Low countries, yealding as sweete honey as some of our English bees*, At Dort . . . 1615. Ed. by C. H. Wilkinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 64 pp. 18s. net.

⁵ *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period*, vol. iii, ed. by George Saintsbury. Oxford: 1921. 551 pp. 16s. net.

the 'long resounding march and energy divine' which Dryden was to communicate to English poetry. There is just a touch of it, however, in the Pindarics of Cowley's disciple Flatman, who is here made accessible. The second notable feature is the subsidence of the lyrical fervour of the greater 'metaphysicals' into a taste for mere neatness of conceit, and the influence, on these last representatives of the Renaissance tradition, of Marino and the Marinisti (made easier to study by the recent publication of Signor Croce's selections from Marino and from his followers). Stanley is the most obvious, the best example of a genuine English Marinist, but Sir Edward Sherburne is another. Hardly a poem of his is probably original. These more even than the more independent Waller are the Ned Softlies of the age. It is strange that Robert Herrick, whose poems in the late Professor Moorman's edition, with a bibliographical note by Mr. Percy Simpson, have been added to the *Oxford Poets*,⁶ has all and more than all the elegance of these poets without any of the deadness as of waxworks which lies on Stanley, Sherburne, and (comparatively) even Waller. The bubble and sparkle of Herrick's fancy are as obvious, wherever one opens this volume, as the finished and exquisite art. A greater spirit if a less equable poet, Andrew Marvell, is the subject of a pleasant appreciation by Mr. Cyril Falls in the *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1921.

Mr. H. F. B. Brett-Smith's edition of Drayton's *Nymphidia*⁷ is very charming, but it has no *apparatus criticus* and need hardly be noticed here.

In the *Cornhill Magazine* for September 1921, Mr. J. W. Brown (who had described fully in the same magazine in May of the preceding year two MS. song-books compiled by Thomas Smith, Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Oxford, and later Bishop of Carlisle) published a number of the poems which Dr. Fellowes, who had examined Smith's song-books, had been unable to assign to any known author. None of the pieces can compare with Bullen's discoveries, but it is well that attention

⁶ *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick*, ed. by F. W. Moorman. Oxford: 1921. viii + 446 pp. 7s.

⁷ *Nymphidia*, by Michael Drayton. Oxford: Blackwell. 30 pp. 5s. net.

should be drawn to these collections, which it is Mr. Brown's intention to deposit in the Bodleian.

An informative essay on a curious by-way of literature, *Some Emblem Books and their Writers*, by Mr. J. K. Floyer, appears in the same number of the *Cornhill*. The subject is indeed a by-way, but George Wither and Henry Peacham, to whom Mr. Floyer devotes considerable space, are not altogether negligible in the history of our literature.

The edition of *The Poems of Richard Lovelace* by the Caxton Club of Chicago consists of two pleasant volumes with a short introduction by Professor W. L. Phelps. It is not a critical edition, nor is the note of the editor intended to be more than a prefatory biographical sketch.

In *A Seventeenth Century Gallery of Poets (Journal of English and Germanic Philology, xi)*, Mr. John J. Parry prints in a full modernized version, from MS. Ashmole 38 in the Bodleian the poem which appeared in part as *On the Time-Poets*, in *Choyce Drollery*, 1656. The MS. assigns it to William Heminge, son of Shakespeare's editor and fellow theatrical manager.

In *Mysticism in Seventeenth-Century English Literature (Studies in Philology, April 1921)*, Mr. Elbert N. S. Thompson has something to say about Sir Thomas Browne, Jeremy Taylor, and Bunyan, as mystics and critics of mysticism, but he devotes considerably more space to the poets from Spenser and Southwell to John Norris of Bemerton (d. 1711). The article is very long, and as it has no obvious design, one is in danger of being lost: nor is it made any more simple by the superfluity of quotations. The chronological method of dealing with the individual poets, Spenser, Donne, Vaughan, and the rest, is perhaps unavoidable. But after leading us to believe that he has said all he means to say on them separately, Mr. Thompson passes on to an explanation of their favourite allegories and figures, illustrating with more quotations from the same poets and incidentally introducing new phases of mysticism. It is pointed out how towards the end of the sixteenth century, and throughout the seventeenth, a very great proportion of the verse produced was religious. Mr. Thompson believes that

this was not the manifestation of a literary fashion but rather the result of a growing seriousness in the national temper and of the ecclesiastical and political turmoil. Yet perhaps the strength of a literary fashion in helping to determine the character of seventeenth century verse is implicitly admitted by the insistence on the profound influence of Spenser on subsequent allegorical and mystical poetry. The short passage on the definition of mysticism and the varieties of mystical experience is excellent. It is unfortunate, however, that again the author reserved some of what should have been said here to be scattered more or less at random through the body of the article. There follows a sketchy, but suggestive, account of the general mystical attitude of nearly all the writers of the period. But Mr. Thompson curiously imagines that Donne 'of all the poets of the Jacobean age . . . would be least suspected of a mystical turn of mind', and then proceeds to show, not very convincingly by the evidence cited, that he was really a mystic, a fact which surely no one ever doubted. The Cambridge Platonists, also, though he eventually allows them to be admitted, he thinks might more reasonably be regarded as occupying a *via media* between the dogmatism of Calvinism and the tendencies of Laud, and attempting to provide a rationalistic basis for Christianity.

As a general rule, American scholars are rather averse to subjects of some magnitude and scope, preferring those which are strictly limited. But Mr. Jacob Zeitlin's *Commonplaces in Elizabethan Life and Letters* (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, xix) is an attempt to cover a large field. It was perhaps unnecessary to prove again that the Elizabethan and the Jacobean periods were much given to sententious commonplaces, and that Shakespeare did not intend us to laugh at Polonius' instructions to Laertes. Mr. Zeitlin, however, makes his survey literary and readable: he does not constantly insist upon the labour which has gone to make it. He draws attention to the interesting fact that the classics which were first translated and which remained the most popular were not histories or other matter-of-fact work, but books like Cicero's *Offices* and Plutarch's *Conjugal Precepts*. It was from such gnomic-classics that Elizabethan and Jacobean writers drew much of their material.

for illustration and ornament. Indeed, so popular were these aphoristic works that commonplace-books and anthologies of sententious quotations were innumerable, and the same proverbial wisdom invaded even business and familiar letters. From the commonplace-book, Mr. Zeitlin thinks, it was but a step to the essay.

There is in *Studies in Philology* (April, 1921) an article by Mr. Morris W. Croll on *Attic Prose in the Seventeenth Century* which is even more comprehensive than the above-mentioned essay. It is not concerned primarily with the anti-Ciceronian movement in this country, nor, despite the title, with the reformation of style which in the last quarter of the sixteenth century gave a new direction to late Renaissance prose and determined its character throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Rather, it is a very suggestive sketch of the struggle between Asianism and Atticism from Plato and the Sophists through Cicero, Tacitus, and Quintilian, to Erasmus, Pico, Lipsius, Bacon, Pascal, and Bossuet.

[BY THE EDITORS]

To the publications surveyed in this chapter there has to be added Professor Grierson's anthology of *Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century*.⁸ Here arranged in three groups, Love Poems, Divine Poems, and Miscellanies, is a veritable 'golden treasury' of the choicest verse of the 'conceited' school from Donne, its leader, to Butler, whose *Hudibras* 'is a savage record of what the human spirit had suffered under the tyranny of metaphysical saints'. To all who have come under the peculiar spell of the metaphysical lyric, this selection, made with fastidious taste and set out with scrupulous exactness in textual detail, will be highly welcome. Professor Grierson has resisted the temptation to be eclectic, and has printed every poem included in the volume (except, of course, the *Hudibras* extract) in full. Whatever the inequalities may be to which the metaphysical poets are specially

⁸ *Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century: Donne to Butler*. Selected and edited, with an Essay, by H. J. C. Grierson. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1921. lviii + 244 pp. 6s. net.

liable, it is right that their lyrical utterances should be judged as organic wholes.

No selection, however catholic, will satisfy in every item any reader, or even (as Professor Grierson hints) the second thoughts of the anthologist himself. Such a merely quaint piece of virtuosity as Herbert's 'Easter wings' might have been spared to make room for one of Cartwright's happier lyrics. And unless Phineas Fletcher was ruled out as a Spenserian, rather than one of the 'metaphysicals', he might fairly have claimed representation.

But we are grateful for what we get, especially as the volume is enriched by an Introduction remarkable for its insight and illuminating quality. The subtle and penetrating study of Donne is what we should expect from the editor of his poems. But scarcely less suggestive are the briefer comments on Carew, the poetic counterpart of Vandyke; on Marvell, 'apart from Milton . . . the most interesting personality between Donne and Dryden, and at his very best a finer poet than either'; on Herbert 'whose central theme is the psychology of his religious experiences'; and on Crashaw with his 'confectionery' conceits. And it is well to be reminded again of the paradoxical fact, to which Coleridge drew attention, that for all their extravagance of thought and imagery, the 'metaphysicals' are distinguished by 'the unconventional purity and naturalness of their diction', and are masters of 'the neutral style'.

As a supplement to the chapter on 'The Elizabethan Period: Poetry and Prose' in the previous volume of *The Year's Work*, a short notice is desirable of the two important articles on Dorothy Osborne's Letters,⁹ by Professor Moore Smith, which appeared near the end of the period surveyed in that volume. From an examination of the MS. diary of Dorothy's brother Henry, in which he has deciphered a number of passages in shorthand untouched by Judge Parry, and from other sources, including the internal evidence of the Letters themselves, Dr. Moore Smith has thrown 'a good deal of new light on Dorothy's self-told history'. Thus he gives fresh details of the negotiations for a marriage between her and Sir J. Isham or Sir T. Osborne, and he identifies the suitor who appeared after they were 'off' as Edmund Wylde,

⁹ *New Light on Dorothy Osborne's Letters*. By G. C. Moore Smith (*Times Literary Supplement*, September 23 and October 28, 1920).

a founder of the Royal Society. Another later suitor 'James B.', mentioned in Letter 62 as a 'chamber-fellow' of Sir William Temple, is shown to be James Beverley, a contemporary of Temple at Emmanuel College.

Besides contributing these and other new facts to Dorothy's story, Dr. Moore Smith suggests a revised order of Letters 1-60, and notes a number of errors in the 'Everyman's Library' text when collated with the MS. originals in the British Museum. He finally makes a plea for a new and more accurate edition.

IX

THE RESTORATION, 1660-1770

[By MONTAGUE SUMMERS]

IN a previous chapter reference has been made to those extracts in Mr. Thorn-Drury's collection, *A Little Ark*, which belong to the earlier half of the seventeenth century.¹ This garland also includes a number of pieces, now first printed from manuscripts or folio broadsides, that date from the Restoration period.

Not the least important of these is 'An Elegy in Commemoration of Madam Ellenor Gwinn, Who Departed this Life on the 14th of November, Anno Dom. 1687'. It is reprinted 'from a folio broadside, the upper part of which is ornamented by a particularly repulsive skull, cross-bones, winged hour-glass, pick-axes, and spades'. A facsimile of this *macabre* sheet forms the frontispiece of the book. This elegy has entirely escaped the general bibliographers, whilst even the specialists, Cunningham and his annotators, H. B. Wheatley, Lavers-Smith, and Gordon Goodwin, had no knowledge of it. The sentiments are becomingly eulogistic, and, as Mr. Thorn-Drury aptly remarks, 'it is pleasant to have other contemporary testimony to the wit, good temper, and charity of Nell Gwyn'. It is curious to note that at one time considerable doubt existed as to the date of her death—Wewitzer unhesitatingly writes 14th March 1691—but this broadside confirms that given by Luttrell, which is now generally accepted.

The 'Ode upon the Happy Return of King Charles II to his Languishing Nations, May 29, 1660. By James Shirley, Gent.', a small quarto tract of four leaves, unknown to Gifford and to the indefatigable Dyce as to the more recent workers upon Shirley, Professor Nason and Dr. Forsythe, is, it must be confessed, surprisingly inferior for a poet of Shirley's gentle genius. Such shambling and shoddy lines perchance deserve even the contempt with which Dryden, Oldham, Robert Gould, and others have so

¹ See Chap. VII, pp. 88-9.

incomprehensibly alluded to the author of those admirable plays *The Cardinal* and *Hyde Park*.

Of particular value to the dramatic historian are the verses 'On that Worthy and Famous Actor, Mr. Charles Hart', the leading performer of the Theatre Royal company; since this broadside, of which only one copy survives, is our sole source of information for the date of Hart's death. In his note upon this elegy Mr. Thorn-Drury takes occasion very definitely to query the statement that Hart was a relative of Shakespeare. There is no contemporary reference to this relationship, and there seems in fine to be no foundation whatsoever for the assertion, which is so persistent, however, that it has even been accepted by so careful a writer as Robert W. Lowe. The elegies upon Walter Clun, who *teste* Pepys excelled in Iago and Subtle, and upon Edward Angel, a low comedian whose Christian name is hence now first known to us, afford useful matter for writers on the Restoration theatre.

Of even more general interest are two items connected with Mrs. Aphra Behn. It was known that Mrs. Behn had written an epilogue for what was thought to have been a revival of Randolph's *Jealous Lovers*, given at the Duke's House in 1682. This epilogue, which was included in the *Miscellany*, 'Being a Collection of Poems By several Hands', 1685, now proves to have been therein printed from a very defective manuscript, and the small-folio leaf reproduced by Mr. Thorn-Drury shows us that the revival was an alteration of the original comedy under the new title *Like Father, like Son: or, The Mistaken Brothers*. Not only, moreover, have we now the prologue, and the epilogue with eleven very pertinent additional lines, but we are even able to date the performance with some exactness. As Mr. Thorn-Drury shows in his scholarly note, this must have taken place on a day between the 11th and 25th March 1682. The Elegy upon 'The Incomparable Astrea. By a Young Lady of Quality' laments the decease of Mrs. Behn in stanzas, intended to be Pindaric, but which for all their artificial phrasing and conventional metaphor seem to be impressed with a personal note and something very like real feeling and regret.

The comprehensive volume by Professor E. K. Broadus, *The Laureateship, A Study of The Office of Poet Laureate in England*, has already been dealt with in another and more general section of

the present work.² But by reason of chapter VI, which has for its theme Dryden, Shadwell, and Tate, this study has good claim to receive some particular mention here also. And this must especially be allowed to be the case when we find that the author emphatically asserts that 'The official laureateship properly begins with the appointment of John Dryden', and again 'The history of the actual laureateship, i. e. the office carrying with it the title of poet laureate and a pension from the crown, and establishing its holder as a functionary of the court, must indubitably begin with the appointment of Dryden in the year 1668'. It should be noticed that considerable misunderstanding has arisen from a confusion of the date of Dryden's appointment to the laureateship with the date of his subsequent appointment to the post of historiographer royal. Dr. Johnson correctly gives 1668 as the date of Dryden's appointment, which he regarded as immediately following on the death of Davenant. Malone, however, stated that Dryden 'did not obtain the laurel till August 18th, 1670', and this he backed up by printing an official document of that date appointing 'the said John Dryden our Poet Laureat and Historiographer Royal'. Accordingly he postulates a hiatus of two years. Scott, Professor Saintsbury, and Leslie Stephen (*Dictionary of National Biography*), all accept Malone's authority without question, whereas Sir A. W. Ward reversed the mistake by giving 1668 as the date of Dryden's appointment to both offices. The fact is that, precisely six days after Davenant's death, there was issued 13th April 1668 a warrant 'for a grant to John Dryden of the Office of Poet Laureate, void by the death of Sir William Davenant', whilst the patent of 18th August 1670 combines the office of historiographer royal with the laureateship, conferring the former and confirming the latter.

By the very terms of his study Mr. Broadus can only afford space to regard Dryden, Shadwell, and Tate from the point of view which he has somewhat rigidly marked out for himself, and accordingly his researches and criticism, however useful in many respects, must necessarily be considered, as supplementary material. There is a very great deal that is difficult to disentangle in the earlier years of Shadwell, and there remain many points which have never been fully investigated, especially with reference to his relations with

² See Chap. I, pp. 9-11.

the Duke and Duchess of Newcastle. By the limitations of his theme Mr. Broadus has no occasion to touch upon these and other even more perplexing matters. He cannot, however, be completely absolved from having paid too little attention to *MacFlecknoe*. Even more open to exception is the assertion that when *The Medal* 'appeared in 1682, Shadwell replied with *The Medal of John Bayes: A Satyr against Folly and Knavery*, with a prefatory "Epistle to the Tories"'. It is true that a number of superficial writers have in gregarious fashion attributed *The Medal of John Bayes* to Shadwell, but there is not a tittle of real evidence to burden him with the authorship of the foul rough rhymes in which Mr. Broadus may find 'crude force' if he will, but which he must not so unhesitatingly describe as 'Shadwell's assault'. Within the somewhat narrow bounds he has appointed we are given no unfair estimate of Shadwell and Nahum Tate. In the case of Shadwell, however, a detailed account of his comedies would not have been at all impertinent, for Langbaine, writing just a year after his appointment as Poet Laureate, describes him as 'a Gentleman whose Dramatick Works are sufficiently known to the World; but especially his Excellent Comedies; which in the Judgement of some Persons, have very deservedly advanced him to the Honour he now enjoys, under the Title of *Poet Laureate* to their present Majesties'.

The very first paragraph with which commences the Avant-Propos introducing Dr. Charles Perromat's detailed study of Wycherley³ at once strikes the right note and prepossesses us in his favour. 'Wycherley, de nos jours, est peu et mal connu. Les Précis de Littérature, en général, l'ignorent, et la plupart de ceux qui en parlent répètent, sans les contrôler, les appréciations de Macaulay ou de Taine. Or, jamais appréciations ne furent plus contestables. Macaulay, jugeant Wycherley avec cet esprit étroit et ces préjugés mesquins qui caractérisent le bon Puritain, n'a vu dans son œuvre que ce qu'il voulait y voir. On sait, d'autre part, comment Taine entendait la critique et, se basant sur les lois qu'il croyait immuables, s'ingéniait à faire rentrer tout auteur, que celui-ci s'y prêtât ou non, dans le cadre rigide qu'il avait d'avance préparé.'

³ *William Wycherley. Sa Vie—Son Œuvre*. Par Charles Perromat, Docteur en lettres. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1921. 471 pp. 20 francs net.

That is well said! Some exception may, it is true, be justly taken to the first sentence. For the neglect which so long obscured the genius and brilliance of Restoration dramatists, amongst whom there was none wittier, none more virile, than William Wycherley, is becoming, nay, has surely become, a reproach of the past, and what might have been true even a quarter of a century ago, happily no longer holds good. It might seem almost superfluous then for Dr. Perromat in the course of this excellent study so carefully and so repeatedly to have refuted Macaulay's verdict upon Wycherley. But in reality Dr. Perromat's able and convincing line of argument is by no means unnecessitated. For owing to Macaulay's epigrammatic turn of style his sentences are apt to stick and be remembered. Their truth is not weighed by the general reader and the half-informed critic, who find these terse phrases dangerously easy to echo and enlarge. It is a pity that when the popular (but, it must be confessed, gravely inaccurate) reprint of Wycherley appeared some thirty years ago in the 'Mermaid' series it was prefaced by a lengthy excerpt from Macaulay's *Comic Dramatists of the Restoration*. Wycherley has never indeed been edited, and a scholarly reprint is a great desideratum. We believe, however, that this reproach may shortly be removed, as a critical recension of Wycherley is in active preparation.

Having devoted his first chapter to a long and detailed Life and Character of Wycherley, the author proceeds meticulously to examine the four comedies, concerning which he says with rare penetration: 'Les comédies de Wycherley, en effet, non seulement surpassent ce qui a été fait de meilleur de son temps, mais ont une valeur d'autant plus rare, qu'elles marquent un point de départ; tout un théâtre, celui des Congreve, Farquhar, Vanbrugh et Sheridan, en est sorti.' Dr. Perromat, although arriving at the same conclusion by a somewhat different line of argument, agrees with Mr. W. C. Ward that the first performance of *Love in a Wood* took place in the spring of 1671. The new play was received with great favour by the town, a success which 's'explique et se justifie'. We are glad to note that Klette's empty charge of plagiarism from Sedley is contested, for *Love in a Wood* manifestly owes nothing to *The Mulberry Garden*, a far inferior piece.

The difficulties concerning the production of *The Gentleman Dancing Master* are amply discussed, but in this connexion it may

be well to warn scholars that Downes is by no means to be relied on implicitly. He was writing nearly forty years later, and 'it is the old story of a senile memory with nothing to check its vagaries . . . the events related mostly took place, but seldom in the sequence indicated.' Dr. Perromat perhaps has not sufficiently realized the difficulties and pitfalls of *Roscius Anglicanus*. But he has done some excellent work in proving by copious extracts from *El Maestro de Danzar* that Wycherley is by no means so indebted to Calderon as facile historians and superficial critics have ignorantly believed.

The full and candid appreciation of *The Country Wife* rises to heights of real eloquence.

'Jamais Wycherley n'avait montré autant de verve entraînante, autant de fantaisie, autant d'esprit, autant de gaieté, autant d'observation malicieuse. A ces dons, innés chez lui, s'ajoutent les qualités qu'il a acquises peu à peu par l'exercice de sa profession si l'on peut dire : un incomparable tour de main, la science de préparer et de graduer les effets, l'adresse de ménager les coups de théâtre. . . . Mais *The Country Wife* vaut mieux encore par le fond que par la forme. Wycherley a relevé sa comédie par une psychologie très fine et une observation très exacte et très profonde. . . . Le dialogue pétille et scintille, flamboie, crépite, se ranime, rebondit. Les mots y foisonnent et s'y bousculent. L'auteur a jeté à poignée les richesses de son esprit, et a voulu nous éblouir par les beautés d'une langue savoureuse et rare. . . . *The Country Wife* est la plus brillante des comédies de Wycherley. Elle est moins profonde que *The Plain Dealer* . . . mais elle est plus égale. . . . C'est assurément l'œuvre d'un grand auteur comique.'

Even Garrick's mischievous blundering ('Quel procédé offensant!') could not wholly devalue this masterpiece of comic genius, and the anaemic *The Country Girl* has surprised and delighted audiences of to-day with its freshness and verve. As Moore once said: 'The very rinsings of Wycherley's play have a raciness in them that is indestructible.' It may be worth noting also a fact which Dr. Perromat has neglected to observe, but which lends no little weight to his championship. The main theme of *The Country Wife*, to which exception has been taken, is the subject of the most popular of all the comedies of Terence, who derived it 'bene vertendo' from Menander. Yet neither Terence nor Menander has been censured and reproved.

Although *The Plain Dealer* is generally considered Wycherley's

finest play—and without question it contains some of his boldest strokes and keenest observation—yet we are inclined to agree with Dr. Perromat that there are certain awkwardnesses and a certain want of nice balance in the construction of the scenes which must be counted as defects. This is not to say that it is not a drama of the very first rank, and one may cordially echo the verdict of Voltaire, who said: 'Je ne connais point de comédie chez les anciens, ni chez les modernes, où il y ait autant d'esprit.'

Not the least valuable pages of Dr. Perromat's study are those he has devoted to the Miscellaneous Poems and Posthumous Works. Although in the general opinion these add little, if anything, to Wycherley's reputation, some of the more epigrammatic poems and saws still reflect the satire of *The Plain Dealer*, and the letters are more easy and natural than the fashionable epistolography of the day. We may notice that Dr. Perromat denies Wycherley's authorship of that rare poem *Hero and Leander in Burlesque*, which, published anonymously in 1669, has sometimes been attributed to him. Students will do well to pay particular attention to the chapters on Wycherley's Influence and Originality, where they will find much that is of sterling value.

In the course of this study we have met with a few details that require revision, but these are of secondary importance. *The Libertine*, for example, should be dated 1675 and not 1676. Notwithstanding the clever argument (p. 184) it is more than probable that Wycherley knew *L'École des Filles*, as, in spite of the wholesale destruction of the first edition in 1655, it was clandestinely reprinted in 1667-8, a fact of which Dr. Perromat does not seem aware. The book was widely diffused in England. It was bought by Pepys, 8th February 1668, and there are allusions to it in Leander's *The Rambling Justice* (Theatre Royal, January 1678), in Ravenscroft's *The London Cuckolds* (Duke's Theatre, 1681), and elsewhere.

We trust it will not seem ungracious to draw attention to the one blemish in so brilliant, exhaustive, and scholarly a work—the bibliography. Here we have first quartos of Wycherley, the Duke of Newcastle, D'Urfey, Ravenscroft, Flecknoe, Southerne, and other original editions duly listed, but side by side with these, and without a word of warning, appear worthless and incomplete reprints.

It was perhaps inevitable that Professor Eccles, in his lecture *Racine in England*,⁴ should have dealt with *The Distrest Mother* in considerable detail, but for scholars it is rather wearisome work to tread once more such well-known ground. He is mistaken, however, in supposing that after its first run in 1711 this drama was 'withdrawn . . . to be revived only in 1735'. Barton Booth, who died 10th May 1733, frequently appeared in his favourite rôle Pyrrhus, and stage historians have amply described the majesty of demeanour he assumed in this part, his acting of which largely contributed to the enduring popularity of the play. Again, the *Andromache*, published under Crowne's auspices, was acted in the winter of 1674 (not in 1675), and Otway's *Titus and Berenice* was produced in 1676, not in 1677 (p. 4). There are other slight errors to be met with, and some omissions must be noticed. Crowne's heroic tragedy, *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, with its long love scenes between Titus and Berenice, acted at Drury Lane in the spring of 1677, and Lee's *Mithridates, King of Pontus*, produced at the same theatre in the spring of the following year, should both have been mentioned. A word or two would have been well given to Ozell, who published his translations *Britannicus* and *The Litigants* in 1714 and 1715, and although scholars are agreed that Wycherley's Widow Blackacre owes nothing to *Les Plaideurs*, the charge of plagiarism has been so often brought that in a lecture upon Racine a refutation were not amiss. The reasons for the English attitude towards Racine, the general lack of genuine appreciation, are rather suggested than discussed, and the exposition, such as it is, seems to go along the obvious lines.

Under the title *Restoration Comedies*⁵ the present writer collected three plays—Thomas Killigrew's *The Parson's Wedding*, Ravenscroft's *The London Cuckolds*, and Crowne's *Sir Courtly Nice*—none of which had before been edited. These plays, which have hitherto been practically unobtainable, were furnished with an ample introduction and fully annotated, the text in each case being carefully

⁴ The Taylorian Lecture, 1921, *Racine in England*, by F. Y. Eccles, M.A., Professor of French Literature in the University of London. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 30 pp. 2s. net.

⁵ *Restoration Comedies. The Parson's Wedding, The London Cuckolds, and Sir Courtly Nice, or, It Cannot Be.* With an Introduction and Notes by Montague Summers. Jonathan Cape, 1921. xlv + 400 pp. 15s. net.

given from the earliest copies, the folio Killigrew, 1663 (with general title 1664); the Ravenscroft quarto, 1682; and the Crowne quarto 1685. The original spelling and stage directions are meticulously retained throughout. *The Parson's Wedding*, which is referred to more than once by Pepys, was generally considered the best work of Thomas Killigrew, 'a merry droll', the first lessee and manager of Drury Lane, and a famous figure in Restoration London. *The London Cuckolds* and *Sir Courtly Nice* both kept the stage until the latter half of the eighteenth century, a fact which of itself sufficiently proves their dramatic value.

It is good to know that Mr. Gaselee's erudite and valuable paper⁶ upon the Spanish books bought by Samuel Pepys is to be reissued with a catalogue made by the same scholar of the important Spanish collections in the Pepysian Library at Magdalene College, Cambridge. Amongst these are many curious and interesting items, which include no less than seventy-one ballads, printed at Seville about 1680 with Lope Falcon's three pasquils, *Curioso Tratado de las Ordenanzas del Tabaco*, twenty-six comedias upon moral and religious subjects, and two bulls, published in 1684, of the saintly Innocent XI. There is no doubt that Pepys was well acquainted with Spanish, and even the most casual reader of the Diary must have remarked his frequent use of Spanish tags and words; para, con, toker (tocar), moher (mujer), camera (camara), and many more continually occur.

In England Spanish literature was widely read and enjoyed. Lord Bristol, Sir Richard Fanshawe, Tuke, Roger L'Estrange, Thomas St. Serf, translated from Calderon, Antonio de Mendoza, Quevedo, Agustin Moreto, whilst our dramatists, Dryden, Wycherley, Crowne, Orrery, Mrs. Behn, owe much in the conduct of their plots to the Spanish theatre. It may be remembered that throughout her life Anne of Austria kept a Spanish court, with Spanish actors and authors.

In his essay *John Crowne and America*⁷ Mr. Arthur Franklin White has with no little care brought together and set in order

⁶ *Samuel Pepys' Spanish Books*, by Stephen Gaselee. *The Library*. Fourth Series, ii, no. 1, pp. 1-11, 1921.

⁷ *John Crowne and America*. Arthur Franklin White. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xxxv, pp. 447-63.

a number of interesting facts, which, if known to a few scholars, had not as yet been thus serviceably correlated. Quite an exceptional number of inaccuracies have been perpetuated concerning the parentage and early life of John Crowne, and from Mr. White's article we are able to correct errors in the accounts of him in various popular works.

John Crowne was for three years a resident of New England and a student at Harvard College. At the end of December 1660 he returned to England with his father, Colonel William Crowne, who was not, as has often been alleged, a preacher, but who served as Rouge Dragon at the coronation of Charles II, 23rd April 1661. John Crowne died 27th April 1712. In the short account which he gives of Crowne's work, Mr. White shows, it must be confessed, little appreciation of his subject. As a dramatist Crowne, although now unduly neglected, had great merit, and that capital fop-comedy, *Sir Courtly Nice*, which has been recently edited by the present writer,⁸ held the stage until the end of the eighteenth century. It should be pointed out that any reference to Crowne's plays must be to the original quartos. The four incomplete volumes of Crowne in Maidment and Logan's *Dramatists of the Restoration* (1874) represent the nadir of that unfortunate series. The text is presented in slipshod and haphazard fashion, and not infrequently—as in the instances of *The Country Wit* (1675) given from the quarto of 1693, and *City Politics* (1683) given from the quarto of 1688—it is derived from a late and inferior edition. Mr. White has, it would seem, made use of this poor reprint, which henceforth must be entirely discarded.

Although *The Careless Husband* was first produced at Drury Lane, 7th December 1704, nevertheless this brilliant comedy of intrigue so clearly maintains with an added flavour of delicacy the tradition of Etherege, Wycherley, Congreve, and the rest, that it is entirely proper that a chapter dealing with the Restoration period should include some notice of Mr. Harry Glicksman's *Stage History of Colley Cibber's 'The Careless Husband'*.⁹ Unfortunately

⁸ See above, pp. 123-4.

⁹ *The Stage History of Colley Cibber's 'The Careless Husband'*, by Harry Glicksman. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xxxvi, pp. 244-50, 1921.

this proves to be nothing more than an indifferently executed, and indeed imperfect, extract from Genest's encyclopaedic volumes. One point certainly calls for attention. *The Careless Husband* was performed at Covent Garden, 9th February 1745, and Genest transcribing, as is his wont, the bill for that day, has 'Not acted 5 years'. Mr. Glicksman, taking these to be Genest's own words, promptly accuses our chronicler of a gross error, inasmuch as *The Careless Husband* was played in 1742, for which date Davenport Adams' *Dictionary of the Drama* is cited as the authority. Mr. Glicksman does not seem aware that Davenport Adams merely copies this particular from Genest, in whose pages is recorded a special revival of *The Careless Husband*, 20th March 1742, 'for the benefit of Cibber Junior' (who appeared as Lord Foppington to the Lady Betty Modish of Peg Woffington), but at Drury Lane.

The 'Not acted 5 years' of the Covent Garden Bill refers only to that particular house, and not to any other theatre. Indeed, *The Careless Husband* was played at Drury Lane, 11th May 1744.

Mr. Glicksman temerarily names 28th November 1792 as the date of the last performance of this comedy. But it was still being acted in the third decade of the nineteenth century, and Harry Johnston, 'the biggest boy in the world,' was celebrated as Sir Charles Easy. In those days the character was dressed as a Regency buck with high stock, open waistcoat, silk stockings, and light pumps. Cumberland, it may be noted, includes *The Careless Husband* in his collection of plays then popular on the boards, fourteen volumes, 1817.

So many influences were for so many years at work upon the fashioning of the Heroic Play that it would be difficult, if not well-nigh impossible, to sum up the origins of this complex form of drama in a few pages. It is none the less true that some particular factor or modification may be briefly and usefully studied in a detached essay if there are new data to discuss or obscurer examples to present, but, although no doubt exceedingly well-intentioned in the writing, Mr. Mervyn L. Poston's article¹⁰ on the Origin of the Heroic Play cannot be said to offer anything fresh for our consideration.

¹⁰ *The Origin of the Heroic Play*, by Mervyn L. Poston. *Modern Language Review*, January 1921. pp. 18-22.

There are, moreover, inaccuracies in detail, and we may not impertinently remark that the 'Heroic Temper' had its seeds further back than Goffe or Cartwright or Lodowick Carlell. To cite only one obvious reference, Dryden himself in 'Of Heroic Plays, An Essay', prefixed to *The Conquest of Granada I* (4to, 1672), names amongst other authors Ariosto and Tasso; nay more, he expressly asserts that 'the first Image' he had of Almanzor 'was from the *Achilles* of *Homer*'. Such a genealogy is open to comment but it cannot be disregarded. In the same essay also Dryden plainly recognizes Davenant as a pioneer in the heroic drama, and he seems to regard *The Siege of Rhodes* as the first English heroic play of Restoration type, although it is by no means entirely developed in 'fulness of plot and the variety of character'. In the face of this opinion Mr. Poston's efforts to depreciate the importance of *The Siege of Rhodes* are inconclusive.

X

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

[By EDITH J. MORLEY]

No work of outstanding importance dealing with this period has been published during the last year. From a purely literary standpoint, perhaps the most interesting text that has appeared is Mr. Martin Freeman's edition of the *Correspondence of Vanessa and Jonathan Swift*.¹ The original letters were 'put to the press' soon after Vanessa's death in 1726, but this premature publication was very properly stopped by the intervention of Dr. Sheridan. From that time, until they were bought by the British Museum in 1919, 'the Swift and Vanessa letters have never even been printed consecutively, except in the edition of Swift's complete works by Sir Walter Scott'. Most of them have, however, been accessible either in that or in Dr. Elrington Ball's edition of Swift's correspondence, but Mr. Freeman is able to make some notable additions to the series. Of these, the most illuminating is Swift's letter to Miss Anne Long which was enclosed in one to Esther Van Homrigh, and was intended for her perusal as well as that of her cousin. This letter may be looked upon as giving the key to Swift's attitude to Vanessa at all events in the earlier stages of their intercourse. It is possible to interpret this less favourably to Swift than does Mr. Freeman, but clearly there is ground for his opinion that Vanessa's attentions to her friend were more particular and noticeable than was relished by the recipient. 'I have a mighty friendship for her. . . . Her greatest favourites at present are Lady Ashburnham, her dog and myself. She makes me of so little consequence that it almost distracts me. She will bid her sister go downstairs before my face, for she has "some

¹ *Vanessa and her Correspondence with Jonathan Swift*, the Letters edited for the first time from the originals, with an Introduction by A. Martin Freeman. Selwyn & Blount, 1921. 216 pp. 7s. 6d. net.

private business with the Doctor". In short, there would never be an end of telling you the hardships she puts on me, only because I have lived a dozen or fifteen years too much.'

The other hitherto unpublished letter (No. XXXII) is pathetic in Vanessa's vain attempts to be cheerful and to obey Swift's commands. 'I have done all that lay in my power to follow your example, for fear of teasing you, but find I cannot defer writing to you any longer.' The erasures in the original are even more significant, e. g. : 'I was so very ill that I thought I should have died, *which if I had it would have m^did both you and I eassy*' [words in italics erased.]

The remaining new Swift-Vanessa matter consists of a note from Swift [XLII], and a postscript [XVII] ; there are also nine hitherto unpublished letters which are not connected with this correspondence and are from another manuscript volume ; and one from the Vanessa MS. volume, also unconnected with its main contents. Further, Mr. Freeman includes in his volume some *Miscellanea* bearing on his main theme, the most important of which is the poem *Cadennus and Vanessa*.

His editing is most careful, and he claims that his text is accurate but for changes of obsolete spellings (and of Vanessa's misspellings) and punctuation. To satisfy the curiosity of those who like to see 'unedited specimens' of her style, there is, in addition to the facsimile of No. XXXII, from which we have already quoted, an exact transcript of XXIX ; both these justify Swift's complaints of feminine illiteracy.

The Introduction gives a dispassionate, balanced account of the relationship between Swift and Vanessa, which disposes of the more sensational legends that have grown up concerning it. Whether Mr. Freeman's exoneration of Swift will be accepted by the reader in its entirety is largely a matter of temperament and, perhaps, of prejudice. But since the story has to be told, and since no one can doubt the suffering of Swift as well as of Vanessa, it is pleasant to find an editor who endeavours to be just to both and who, if he extenuates nothing, yet sets down nought in malice. No student of Swift can afford to neglect the volume. It is, therefore, a pity that the binding is so unsatisfactory that it becomes loose in a single reading. This is the more to be regretted that paper and print are both good. There is a slip in grammar in the

note on p. 77 ('afraid to stay at the same house *as her*') which needs correction in any future edition.

In the first issue of *The Year's Work* we noticed Martin Secker's 2s 6d. reprint of *The Beggar's Opera* with its attractive coloured cover by Lovat Fraser. This year comes William Heinemann's édition-de-luxe,² with eight full-page plates, and numerous head- and tail-pieces by the same artist. The joy in handling and looking at this delightful volume is tempered only by the inevitable sorrow that is felt when we remember that Lovat Fraser is dead. None of his work is more full of humour, artistic force, and beauty of design than the illustrations to this volume, and it is lamentable that his achievement is complete, and that the life of one so rich in promise of yet greater things is at an end. Even Mr. Drinkwater's preface, with its finely-worded and finely-felt appreciation of the man and the artist, cannot reconcile us to the loss of one of whom it can truly be said that 'beauty of spirit flowed in everything he did into beauty of execution.'

He had a heart to praise, an eye to see,
And beauty was his king.

Fraser's own note on his difficulties in staging *The Beggar's Opera* tells us something of his artistic sincerity and artistic conscience. To destroy the labour of months and 'to start feverishly afresh' three weeks before 'the actual work was due to be carried out at the costumier's and in the painting shops' would not have been possible to any one with a less high conception of his purpose; it is pleasant, therefore, to remember that the audiences at Hammersmith have proved by their appreciation that they were worthy of the artist who wrestled with his difficulties to produce the scene and design the dresses that have delighted them. In this volume the scene and characters live again and crystallize the joys of the Hammersmith revival. Paper and print and cover are worthy alike of the illustrations and of Mr. Gay's text, and every one concerned may be congratulated on an admirable result.

Professor Hecht has made an elaborate and detailed investigation into the work of Daniel Webb, a nearly-forgotten critic of the

² *The Beggar's Opera*, written by Mr. Gay. Scenes and costumes by C. Lovat Fraser. William Heinemann, 1921. xiii+93 pp. 15s. net.

eighteenth century whose work is very little known and not easy to obtain. He also reprints the *Remarks on the Beauties of Poetry*—a contribution of some importance to the beginnings of aesthetics at that period.³ It appeared in 1762, the same year as Hurd's *Letters on Chivalry and Romance*, and six years later than Burke's *Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful*. Webb's chief interest for us is that he was among the earliest to cast doubts on the beauty of the regular heroic couplet, and to contrast Pope's versification disadvantageously with that of Milton. But historically he has also his importance as being one of the first Englishmen to attempt an investigation into the beauties of the fine arts, and to seek to establish the relationship between them. Professor Hecht shows Webb's dependence on the ancients, and that his knowledge of—at any rate his references to—English writers and the moderns generally are comparatively few. He borrows freely from foreign critics, notably from Anton Mengs and from Winckelmann, but he learns from them to appreciate the worth of the fine arts, and he makes his own that which he appropriates. More important still, he makes it current knowledge among his countrymen.

The reprint of the *Remarks on the Beauties of Poetry* will be of real service to students of critical thought. It is essential for them to be able to obtain first-hand knowledge of small as well as of great writers if they are to trace the developments of literary taste. Webb's essay is significant of more than one tendency in the second half of the eighteenth century, and Professor Hecht is to be congratulated on his sane and balanced account of the man and his work.

Dr. Danielowski's examination⁴ of the journals and diaries of the early Quakers is an amplification of her study of Richardson's first novel—a dissertation published in 1917. She sets out to prove that the time was ripe for the appearance of such a novel as *Pamela*, and that many of the elements of the sentimental novel of

³ *Daniel Webb, ein Beitrag zur englischen Ästhetik des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, mit einem Abdruck der *Remarks on the Beauties of Poetry* [1762] und einem Titelkupfer von Hans Hecht. Henri Grand, Hamburg-Altrahlstedt, 1920. 117 pp. M. 10.

⁴ *Die Journale der frühen Quäker*, 2^{ter} Beitrag zur Geschichte des modernen Romans in England von Dr. Emma Danielowski. Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1921. x+138 pp.

manners and character are to be found in the autobiographies of the Quakers as well as in the essayists where they have been more generally recognized. Dr. Danielowski examines in detail and with many quotations the journals of some leading Quakers, including those of Thomas Ellwood and of Penn; she shows that in arrangement, form, and style these have much in common with Richardson's first attempt, and that even his letter-method is not original. (See e. g. Banks's letter to his daughter Sarah, when in service, pp. 37/8). The author does not claim that Richardson was directly influenced by these predecessors, but that his sentimental treatment of reality was no new thing; that the mixture of 'narrative and reflection', the sermonising, the psychological analysis are all to be found long before his day in writings which claimed to relate fact, not fiction. 'Die Journale der frühen Quäker bilden weder eine Vorstufe der Pamelageschichte, noch haben sie Richardson stofflich als Vorlage gedient.' But Richardson utilized tendencies which were prevalent at the time, and those tendencies may be studied in the Quaker journals and diaries.

Dr. Danielowski labours her points rather heavily, but they are worth making, and they have not previously been illustrated by so detailed an investigation of sources.

Lindsey's 'letters' ⁵ are of value only as an index to the character, interests and pursuits of the writer, and as throwing light upon the various religious and political controversies of the age in which he lived.' This verdict of Dr. McLachlan, his editor, needs no comment or addition. Lindsey's interest for us is not literary, but he helps us to reconstruct the social background of his age, and from this point of view Dr. McLachlan's careful exposition of his life and times and copious extracts from the letters are of importance to students of the eighteenth century, and more particularly of Unitarian theology.

Dr. Göricke's study of social ideals ⁶ in *The Tatler*, *The Spectator*, and *The Guardian* is preceded by a careful analysis of the perfect

⁵ *Letters of Theophilus Lindsey*, by H. McLachlan, M.A., D.D., Manchester University Press. Longmans, Green & Co., 1920. xii + 148 pp. 6s. net.

⁶ *Das Bildungsideal bei Addison und Steele*, by Walter Göricke. Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie. Peter Hanstein, 1921. 55 pp. M. 3.

courtier as conceived by Castiglione, and of his influence in Elizabethan and later England. The writer traces the gradual development of middle-class ideas of the meaning of the word 'gentleman', and proceeds from these to the modifications found in Addison and Steele. The study is, doubtless, of peculiar value to foreigners, but is by no means devoid of interest to ourselves. While the essayists recognize the importance of good birth, they emphasize, nevertheless, the at least equally cogent need for good-breeding and virtue;—'The appellation of a gentleman is never to be affixed to a man's circumstances, but to his behaviour in them' (*Tatler*, 207). The attitude revealed towards learning is curiously indicative of eighteenth-century rationalism. By learning 'I mean all useful knowledge, whether speculative or practical' (*Guardian*, 111), and the numerous quotations Dr. Göricke brings together illustrate the point of view. Thus: 'It is observed too often that men of wit do so much employ their thoughts upon fine speculations, that things useful to mankind are wholly neglected' (*Tatler*, 18), and, as a sequence, 'it is not justifiable to spend so much time in that which so very few are judges of' (*Guardian*, 94). The gentleman's education is to include 'the whole course of the polite arts and sciences', but always with a view to practical results. Nor is it without bearing on the attitude of the time that: 'The height of good-breeding is shown rather in never giving offence than in doing obliging things' (*Tatler*, 21),; or that, 'The lettered coxcombs without good-breeding give more just occasion to raillery, than the unlettered coxcombs with it,' (*Guardian*, 94).

These are only some of the aspects of the subject revealed by the series of quotations and references collected under various headings. The last section is a brief attempt to apply the results to modern English society. Dr. Göricke finds that the eighteenth-century spirit of compromise persists; that the 'gegenseitige Durchdringung der adligen und der bürgerlichen Geistessphären, um eine höchst verwickelte Wechselwirkung, die seit den Tagen Addisons und Steeles, wo sie zum ersten Mal deutlich in die Erscheinung tritt, weiter fortgewirkt, und zu einer Einheitlichkeit der englischen Gesellschaft geführt hat, die imponierend und ohne Beispiel ist'. As a result there is, he holds, a strong tendency to uniformity in English life, combined with loss of individuality, and consequent social monotony.

In an article in *Modern Philology*,⁷ W. S. Hendrix points out 'certain parallels in thought, but rarely in words, between the *Tatler*' and Quevedo, Guevara, and Le Sage. He quotes corresponding passages, and seems to establish Steele's familiarity with the Spanish and French authors mentioned in his title.

Sir James Frazer reprints in his *Sir Roger de Coverley*⁸ volume, five supplementary pseudo *Spectator Club Essays*, which originally appeared as an introduction to a selection of Addison's essays, and as contributions to *The Saturday Review*. The other paper in the volume dealing with an eighteenth-century subject is a biographical account of Cowper, first prefixed to a selection of his letters. Sir James is apparently an enthusiastic admirer of Cowper, 'one of the most charming of English poets', whose *Task* is 'one of the most delightful works in the English language'. It is always pleasant to read an appreciation by a writer of balanced and thoughtful mind, but neither here nor in the *Sir Roger* essays does Sir James contribute anything fresh to our knowledge of the subjects he has chosen.

In the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*,⁹ Mr. F. B. Kaye writes a detailed account of the certain, doubtful, and spurious writings of Bernard Mandeville, arguing 'the question of attribution to Mandeville wherever this is necessary'. He also analyses the contents of each genuine work in such a way as to throw light on the development of the author's thought and its relation to the *Fable of the Bees*. Mr. Kaye claims to have 'found evidence of an influence so far-reaching and fundamental' that he believes he is not 'exaggerating in describing Mandeville as one of the most important writers of the century, whose influence is to be compared with that of Hume and Adam Smith'. But the substantiation of this belief in Mandeville's importance 'in the spheres of ethics and

⁷ *Quevedo, Guevara, Le Sage, and The Tatler*, by W. S. Hendrix, *Modern Philology*, xix, no. 2, November 1921, pp. 177-186.

⁸ *Sir Roger de Coverley and Other Literary Pieces*, by Sir James George Frazer. Macmillan & Co., 1920. xii + 319 pp. 8s. 6d. net.

⁹ *The Writings of Bernard Mandeville: A Bibliographical Survey*, by F. B. Kaye. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, xx, no. 4, October 1921. pp. 419-67. University of Illinois. \$1 a single number, \$3 a volume.

economics' is reserved for a forthcoming edition of his *Fable of the Bees* (Clarendon Press). The scope of the present article is confined to a scholarly survey of the other writings of Mandeville, which have hitherto been almost entirely neglected, except in the German edition by Paul Sakmann (1897), which is not, in Mr. Kaye's opinion, altogether satisfactory.

The *Life and Letters of John Gay*,¹⁰ by Mr. Melville, except in so far as it makes available Gay's letters which alone render it worth notice here, is a disappointing volume. It shows no critical acumen and adds little or nothing to Underhill's *Introductory Memoir* to the 'Muses' Library' edition of Gay's poems.

Mr. Melville is right when he says that Gay was a 'considerable figure in the literary and social circles of his day'. But he does little to make us realize Gay's indubitable attraction for his contemporaries. Why did Pope love him or Swift care for him 'more than for any man'; how was it that the Duchess of Queensberry thought it worth while to incur banishment from court for his sake? Mr. Melville lets us vainly pause for a reply, and while we willingly admit the difficulty of reviving Gay's personal charm, we yet think a biographer fails if he succeed in giving no hint of it.

Similarly we must question the judgement of a critic who says (p. 81) that 'As a literary work *The Beggar's Opera* has no great claims but there is a spontaneous humour about it that has charm'. Nor, to take only one other instance, is there any attempt to examine the value of the *Fables* or, except for one unfortunate sentence on p. 150, of *The Shepherd's Week* or of *Trivia*.

Finally, in addition to much slipshod writing, we note several misprints, of which one of the most serious is the twice-repeated 'Underwood' for 'Underhill' (pp. ix, x).

Dr. R. Foster Jones has completed a piece of work which has long awaited a careful investigator. He has examined¹¹ Theobald's contribution to eighteenth-century criticism, and established the position that ought to be taken by his edition of Shakespeare. This

¹⁰ *Life and Letters of John Gay*, by Lewis Melville. Daniel O'Connor, 1921. xii+167 pp. 8s. 6d. net.

¹¹ *Lewis Theobald, his Contribution to English Scholarship, with some Unpublished Letters*, by Richard Foster Jones, Ph.D. Columbia University Press, and London, Humphrey Milford, 1919. xi+363 pp. \$2.00.

has too often been judged according to Pope's spiteful estimate, and without due recognition of its merit. What Dr. Jones, in a learned and useful chapter on the subject, rightly calls 'the rage for emending' indubitably affected *Shakespeare Restored*, 1726, and some of Theobald's ludicrous alterations of the text in that early work are too absurd to be easily forgotten. But this is not the whole story. The man who substituted *scotch'd* for *scorch'd* in the line: 'We have scotch'd the snake, not kill'd it', cannot fairly be judged only by his failures even if we confine ourselves to a survey of his textual emendations. However, Theobald contributed more than these to Shakespearian study, and later on he produced the first scholarly edition of the plays. In this he showed genuine respect for the authority of his text, and poetic feeling in his criticisms and alterations: he had also the 'spirit of scholarship that refuses to accept anything that cannot be buttressed with proofs and reasons'. He realized the necessity for thoroughness, more particularly in the presentation of 'the best text possible illuminated with all necessary explanations. By emendation he meant not only correcting by conjecture, but also the restoring, by collation, of a better variant reading'. Further, by the time when he edited Shakespeare in 1734, he had explored widely in earlier English literature: in his preface he claims to have read over 800 old plays, and 'though this statement is a palpable exaggeration . . . yet there was some basis for it'. He knew a good many authors other than dramatists, and by his reading he discovered many of Shakespeare's sources. His notes 'are a mine of miscellaneous information, clearing up fully and once for all what might have remained undetected for generations' (J. Churton Collins). Like Bentley, whose methods he closely followed, Theobald, by investigation and comparison which confirmed his conjectures, proved each step that led him to reach a conclusion. Without such confirmation plausible theories were ruthlessly rejected. Dr. Jones points out, for example, how Theobald searched in vain for a copy of Lodge's *Rosalynde*, because he was persuaded that if successful he would 'find many of our Author's Canzonets on this Subject to be scraps of the Doctor's amorous Muse'. It was left for Johnson to discover the nature and scope of Shakespeare's indebtedness to Lodge in *As You Like It*, but the way was thus clearly pointed out to him by Theobald. Dr. Jones calls attention incidentally to Dr. Nichol Smith's *Eighteenth*

Century Essays on Shakespeare, the introduction to which contains some erroneous statements due to imperfect acquaintance with Theobald's edition and preface.

It must not be supposed that Dr. Jones passes lightly over the faults of Theobald's work, but these are more familiar than its merits and need not be detailed here. What is for the first time proved and fully illustrated is Theobald's contribution to scholarship—the excellence of his methods and the influence he exerted on his successors. By the close of the century 'the modern method of critical editing [was] fairly well outlined and established'. To no individual is this so much due as to Theobald, Pope's dunce, who first applied to English scholarship the scientific methods of Bentley, but combined with aesthetic penetration not possessed by the greater man.

In a brief article on *Joseph Warton's Criticism of Pope*¹² the present writer shows the extent to which Warton cut up his *Essay on Pope* to form the notes and introduction to the edition of the poems published twenty years later. Not merely this, but he was meticulously careful to omit nothing, however unimportant, from the later work that had appeared in the earlier. So much is this the case, that one half of the original sentence often appears in one volume and the rest in another of the 'Complete Works'.

Ronald Crane and Hamilton Jewett Smith illustrate¹³ in some detail 'the close filiation which exists between the *Citizen of the World* and the *Lettres Chinoises* of the Marquis d'Argens'. The article shows that Goldsmith's borrowings from this source explain various features in the *Citizen of the World* and throw light on his methods of composition. But 'they account for none of the traits which constitute the essential originality of Goldsmith's work'.

In an article in *Essays and Studies*,¹⁴ Canon Cruickshank 'ventures to claim' that Parnell 'deserves to be read again', and

¹² *Joseph Warton's Criticism of Pope*, by Edith J. Morley. *Modern Language Notes (of America)*, xxxvi, no. 5, May 1921. pp. 276-81.

¹³ *A French Influence on Goldsmith's Citizen of the World*, by Ronald Crane and Hamilton Jewett Smith. *Modern Philology*, xix, no. 1, August 1921. pp. 83-92.

¹⁴ *Thomas Parnell, or What was wrong with the Eighteenth Century*, by A. H. Cruickshank. *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Associa-*

he supports his contention by an examination of the writings and reputation of that half-forgotten poet. The sub-title of the essay, 'What was wrong with the Eighteenth Century', is perhaps hardly justified by the cursory discussion given to the subject.

Mr. John W. Draper¹⁵ in a discussion in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, traces 'the semantic history of *μίμησις*' in the eighteenth century, showing that it 'reflects the period of authority during the first third of the century, and the period, during the middle decades, of scientific inquiry and of sentimental reaction, which later passed into the age of Romantic revolt'. The article is a valuable contribution to the study of Aristotelian influence on English criticism.

In *Neophilologus*¹⁶ the same author writes on 'The Theory of Translation in the Eighteenth Century'.

It is not without melancholy that one remembers that for the 'Later' of the title-page, the reader must substitute 'Last', and that these Essays¹⁷ of Austin Dobson will be followed by no new ones by the same hand. For, as one reads them, one realizes afresh his lightness of touch and the learning which it enhances. Surely no one now living can steer so securely among the shoals of the eighteenth century, or can reproduce for us the great figures and small whom he knew so intimately that he could revivify them in half a dozen pages? In this, the tenth volume of the writer's studies, mainly in the century he loved, he deals with only one man of first-rate importance, John Howard, the prison reformer, but in by-paths as on the high road he is a guide to be followed, and he touches nothing which he does not adorn. The Abbé Edgeworth, 'Hermes' Harris, Mrs. Elizabeth Carter the blue-stocking, Edwards of the 'Canons of Criticism', and Dr. Heberden are the subjects of the essays in this volume, which concludes with *tiēn*, vol. vii. Collected by John Bailey. pp. 57-81. Clarendon Press, 1921. 5s. net.

¹⁵ *Aristotelean 'Mimesis' in England*, by John W. Draper. *P.M.L.A.*, vol. xxxvi, No. 3, September 1921. pp. 372-400.

¹⁶ *The Theory of Translation in the Eighteenth Century*, by John W. Draper. *Neophilologus*.

¹⁷ *Later Essays, 1917-20*, by Austin Dobson. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1921. 180 pp. 6s. 6d. net.

'A Casual Causerie' ranging over a variety of subjects. Every page bears upon it the stamp of that personal knowledge which enabled the writer to recreate the eighteenth century for others as well as for himself. In default of the cap of Fortunatus, the volumes of Austin Dobson are the best means by which to become cognisant of the very form and pressure of the period he knew better than any of his contemporaries.

In *The Tale of Terror*,¹⁸ Miss Birkhead gives a detailed and thorough account of the blood-curdling volumes which thrilled readers during the period of the 'romantic revival', and she recounts the plots—good, bad, and indifferent—without losing either her sense of humour or her power of discrimination. This is in itself no inconsiderable feat when, as she reminds us, even Henry Tilney shared Catherine Morland's delight in the 'horrid' stories recommended by Miss Andrews, and when a still better judge, no less a man than Sir Walter Scott, at one time began such a tale on his own account.

Miss Birkhead has produced a readable book about tales, many of which are no longer readable, and her 'attempt to trace in outline the origin of the Gothic romance' is justified by its success. The introductory chapter seems to us to go too far in its search for origins, even though it is balanced by a conclusion, which attempts to deal with the present-day equivalent of the genre. Or, perhaps it would be better to recast this criticism and say that while we agree that 'the future of the tale of terror it is impossible to predict', we feel that Miss Birkhead would have been wiser to decide definitely between two modes of treatment. She might have confined herself strictly to the 'Tale of Terror', properly so-called, i.e. that which was directly inspired by or akin to *The Castle of Otranto*, and belonged to the last years of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth. Or, and this would have given more scope for original criticism, she might have examined the motive of terror in art and literature with a view to determining the aesthetic effect and value of the thrill (e.g. in Grand Guignol melodrama). As it is, the brief introductory remarks and the last chapters give the impression of being

¹⁸ *The Tale of Terror, A Study of the Gothic Romance*, by Edith Birkhead, M.A. Constable & Co., 1921. xi+241 pp. 15s. net.

tacked-on to a subject of which they do not form an integral part, while the underlying connexion is not made sufficiently clear. It is stretching the term to breaking-point to include Stevenson's *New Arabian Nights* or Kipling's *The Mark of the Beast* in *A Study of the Gothic Romance*: with them, and long before them, a tale of terror is something very different from *The Tale of Terror* which is Miss Birkhead's subject. This she would doubtless readily admit: she might even protest that she had explicitly stated it as a fact. But any one who read, say Chapter X (Short Tales of Terror) without previous knowledge of the subject, might easily be led to confuse the terrible in fiction with 'The Tale of Terror' properly so-called. In a work so erudite and, with this exception, so well-balanced, the mere possibility is a misfortune. For Miss Birkhead's study of *The Tale of Terror* is a valuable addition to our knowledge of the subject, and it is one which must be taken into account by all who wish to understand the popularity of the story that

'Lived upon ghosts, goblins, and skeletons'.

Readers of Miss Birkhead's book may like to supplement it by reference to two articles which have recently appeared in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*.¹⁹ Associate-Professor McIntyre elaborates the theory that the novels of Mrs. Radcliffe and her followers are not an expression of the life and spirit of the Middle Ages, but of those of the Renaissance as interpreted by Elizabethan England. She considers that the term *Gothic Novel* is inaccurate, and that the epithet must not be taken to imply too much. Mrs. Radcliffe was more indebted to Shakespeare and the Elizabethan stage than to the Middle Ages.

Professor Shackford finds 'certain indefinable likenesses in spirit and atmosphere' between Keats's *Eve of St. Agnes* and Mrs. Radcliffe's *Mysteries of Udolpho*, and she also gives a selection of parallel passages which, she thinks, show that Keats drew some of the suggestions for the poem from his knowledge of the novel.

¹⁹ Were the 'Gothic Novels' Gothic? by Clara F. McIntyre. *P.M.L.A.*, vol. xxxvi, No. 4, December 1921. pp. 644-67. *The Eve of St. Agnes, and 'The Mysteries of Udolpho'*, by Martha Hale Shackford. *P.M.L.A.*, vol. xxxvi, No. 1, March 1921. pp. 104-18.

She is, however, careful to insist that Keats used his reminiscences in an intensely imaginative and independent fashion, and that to find in Mrs. Radcliffe one of his sources is in no way to impugn his originality, but just the reverse.

Mr. Finch and Professor Peers contribute to *Modern Philology*²⁰ a detailed account of the controversy between Voltaire and Horace Walpole on the respective merits of Shakespeare and of Corneille and Racine. The letters they publish prove that, as early as 1768, Voltaire already repented 'having introduced the *histrion barbare* to French readers'. They also show Walpole willing to 'fight to the death for the superiority of Shakespeare'.

The Florence Press edition of Blake's poetry²¹ is complete but for the *Prophetic Books* and the unfinished *French Revolution*, the text being that of Dr. Sampson's Oxford edition of 1905. 'There is something', says the editor, 'of homage and fitness in producing the poems of Blake in a form which would have appealed to that artist-poet, and in a character—this Florence type—which for him might well have symbolized the birthplace of his hero Michelangelo. True, we must relinquish the exquisite designs which Blake interwove with the fabric of his verse, yet there may still be a positive advantage in reading these poems as poetry and nothing more, rather than in viewing them as "fairy missals" or as "pictures singing". Our text too . . . is a faithful reproduction of the original. . . .'

There is no need to say more of the text than that Dr. Sampson is the editor, and that he makes for it this claim of accuracy. The Florence type, designed by the late Herbert P. Horne, and modelled on the Italian masterpieces of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, is by this time well known to all book lovers as one of the 'foremost representatives of the modern typographical revival in Great Britain'. The fount is severely simple with all the beauty of simplicity, and the book is in every respect as

²⁰ *Walpole's Relations with Voltaire*, by M. B. Finch and E. Allison Peers. *Modern Philology*, August 1920. pp. 189-200.

²¹ *The Poems of William Blake*, edited and arranged with a Preface by John Sampson, D.Litt. At the Florence Press: Chatto & Windus, 1921. xxxviii + 344 pp. 15s. net.

well-produced as good editing, good workmanship, and good material can make it. To possess it is to be 'born to Sweet Delight'—we think Blake need not have resented this application of his words, much as it may differ from their original meaning.

In his booklet on *Blake and Milton*,²² Dr. Saurat endeavours to establish the existence of 'a peculiar relationship' between these two poets. He shows first of all that Milton exercised a direct influence over Blake, who draws many of his conceptions from *Paradise Lost*. Further, Dr. Saurat maintains that there is 'remarkable similarity of mind and temperament' between them; that there are close parallels between 'their central conception of life' and their 'general metaphysical outlook, and particularly in their way of dealing with dogma or myth'. These theses he supports by a detailed examination of the writings of both poets, which, if not entirely convincing, at any rate suggests interesting points of comparison and shows a great deal of industry. It is not easy to prove that 'Blake and Milton came to metaphysical questions with much the same intellectual methods', or that the mysticism of Blake is really but another form of Milton's creed that 'all of us are of God'. Superficially, no doubt, there is similarity between these positions. But the two men gain their faith in a different way; and Blake's vision and 'double vision' appear to be fundamentally different from Milton's belief that there are 'allegorical explanations' underlying the 'exactitude of the historical narrative' of the Gospels. Blake's attempt to explain his mythology may sometimes approach rationalism, but the visions upon which it is founded are those of a mystic, while, as Dr. Saurat himself admits, Milton's whole outlook is determined by reason. 'Milton's reason bade him try to mend this world; and Blake's desire attempted to create another.'

Dr. Keynes's *Bibliography of Blake*²³ is an exhaustive compilation which is worthy of its subject. It must nearly approach

²² *Blake and Milton*, by Denis Saurat. Librairie Félix Alcan. Paris, 1920. 75 pp. 9 francs + majoration de 20 per cent. du prix marqué.

²³ *A Bibliography of William Blake*, by Geoffrey Keynes. For the Grolier Club of New York. London: Chiswick Press, 1921. xvi + 516 pp. 250 copies printed, of which 220 are for sale at \$50 to members of the Grolier Club.

bibliographical completeness, and scholars will be grateful both to him and to the American collectors who have furthered his monumental work. Dr. Keynes has achieved the purpose with which he set out. The Bibliography 'is not a mere catalogue of Blake's works and of books connected with him'; it will serve, as was intended, 'as a foundation upon which future studies, whether biographical or critical, may be securely built'.

The volume is divided into five main sections, entitled respectively Blake's Works, Book Illustrations, Biography and Criticism, Miscellaneous: in addition there are six appendices and an admirable Index which adds to the pleasure of the reader. Each section is prefixed by a bibliographical preface; there are four full-page reproductions in colour, forty reproductions in monochrome, and twelve reproductions in the text. It would be a pleasant task to describe in some detail the points made by Dr. Keynes in his prefaces or the hitherto unpublished letters by Blake. For this there is no space, but students of Blake will have reason to be grateful for the consequent necessity to seek out the volume for themselves. The one drawback we can find to this luxurious edition is that it is inevitably so limited in numbers.

Dr. Keynes will doubtless rejoice to learn that the annotated autograph transcript by Blake of passages from the preface to Wordsworth's *Excursion* and from *The Recluse* referred to on p. 54, in the note to 21, has not, as he supposes, disappeared. It is preserved among Crabb Robinson's *Remains* at Dr. Williams's Library, Gordon Square, London, and a copy is included in a volume of extracts from the *Remains*, published this autumn at the Manchester University Press.

Dr. McNaught is well known as an enthusiastic admirer of Burns, and in this book²⁴ he endeavours finally to dispose of the myths that have grown up about the poet's life and character by giving *The Truth about Burns*. The early biographers had, he tells us, 'little or no first-hand knowledge of their subject . . . and never was the private life and personality of a great man so ruthlessly invaded and barbarously dissected' as by them. Further,

²⁴ *The Truth about Burns*, by D. McNaught, J.P. & LL.D. Macle hose, Jackson & Co., 1921. x + 246 pp. 7s. 6d. net.

the truculent tone adopted by some recent commentators has roused a strong feeling of resentment in Burnsian circles which has begotten a determination to put everything recorded by the biographers to the test of contemporary evidence and that which has come to light since their day'. This test Dr. McNaught applies with skill and with knowledge, and he succeeds in disproving some of the accusations commonly brought against the poet, e. g. that he was an habitual drunkard. As is justly observed, 'Burns's physical constitution was an effectual bar to chronic dissipation'. Dr. McNaught is prejudiced in the poet's favour, but his evidence is judicially examined and presented in a balanced way. It should be unnecessary further to labour his points, though it is perhaps too much to hope that future commentators will pass over in silence the unsavoury stories which have collected about the poet's biography.

If any University woman of the twentieth century is misguided enough to believe that her female ancestors were necessarily debarred from the pursuit of letters, this exhaustive volume²⁵ by Professor Myra Reynolds should finally disabuse her of her error. The learned lady in England as elsewhere did not find the way made easy for her, especially in the eighteenth century, but many individuals surmounted difficulties with wonderful patience and tenacity, and by their success helped to win intellectual freedom for their successors. Indeed Professor Reynolds goes so far as to say that 'Macaulay's statement concerning the illiteracy of the women of the period may have some justification, but the exceptions are so numerous as almost to disprove the rule'. Whether or no this be true, as one studies her bulky volume one is at least convinced that she has amply carried out her purpose 'to show the number of women whose interests were intellectual, whose chosen pursuits had to do with books and things of the mind, and who were demanding a new freedom of self-expression, new training, and new opportunities'. The book forms a fitting contribution to a series 'published in honour of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Vassar College'—the first women's college in the States. However, it must not be regarded in any sense as

²⁵ *The Learned Lady in England, 1650-1760*, by Myra Reynolds. Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920. 489 pp. \$2.23.

a feminist manifesto. Professor Reynolds has no axe to grind. She does honour to many women whose names have, some of them, been almost forgotten, and have never before been collected within the covers of a single book. From Dame Juliana of Norwich to Margaret Roper, from Lady Jane Grey to Mrs. Delany, from Mary Astell and Elizabeth Elstob to the women diarists, letter- and memoir-writers and novelists, 'here is God's plenty'. Yet of those coming within the limits of her title, Professor Reynolds acknowledges honestly 'the writing done by women between 1660 and 1760 is more impressive from its amount and variety than from any high excellence of its component parts'. And again: 'What was actually accomplished in the century before 1760 was a lavish sowing of seed, a steady infiltration of new ideas, and an accumulation of examples proving women capable of the most varied intellectual aptitudes and energies'.

One other of the many points brought out by Professor Reynolds is worth emphasis here. She notes that the standard of morality exhibited in Restoration comedy cannot be regarded as typical even of aristocratic society of the time, however representative it may be of one phase of it. 'Margaret Blagge, Anne Killigrew, and Anne Kingsmill, women of the most sincere and ardent piety, were in intimate association with the courts of Charles II and James II. Lady Pakington, Lady Brooke, Lady Halkett, Lady Masham, Lady Russell, Mary Astell, Lady Elizabeth Hastings, and later, Lady Huntington, were all by rank or especial opportunity in the highest and most exclusive social circles and so in contact with the profligacy of the court. Their extreme assiduity in all matters of religion . . . and their austere moral standards were a violent reaction from the evil life about them. In the homes and small social circles where their influence could be felt was being prepared a body of moral indignation, a desire for uprightness and purity of life, that gave to Jeremy Collier's attack on the stage in 1698 so overwhelming a response, and that was the sustaining force back of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century.'

In this, as in most matters, loose generalizations have to be corrected by more exact knowledge. Professor Reynolds's study

is an excellent example of the way in which a close examination of detail may be used by a scholar to illuminate large social processes and movements. In her book, if the particular is not lost sight of in the general, neither is the general forgotten in the particular.

'The history of English village literature since 1750 becomes a chapter in the social history of England, and it is from this point of view that the present study²⁶ is written.' 'In this study, therefore, village literature connects itself on the one side with conventions of the pastoral and Georgic; with heroic couplet and English prose and new verse-forms; with eighteenth-century sentimentalism and the romantic movement. On the other side it connects itself with the growth of a democratic spirit in an aristocratic age; with two great movements, the industrial revolution and the less familiar, but almost more fundamental agrarian revolution.' These sentences set forth very fairly Dr. Patton's aims and her achievement. In her second and third chapters, 'From the Medieval Village to the Modern', and 'The Changing Village and the National Life', she gives a clear and a convincing account of the changes which revolutionized the English village, altering it from a co-operative unit with genuine community life to the competitive society of the present day. The social and economic developments and their consequences are traced with so much understanding of the forces at work that at first the reader is inclined to doubt whether the 'literary study' will show equal grasp and ability. The fear is groundless. In the chapters which follow ('The Village established in Literature, 1770-1800', and 'The Village in Poetry, 1800-1850'), Miss Patton, in a carefully documented survey, proves that her critical and literary judgement has not been submerged by her interest in economics. She has read very widely, both great poets and small, and she is able to discriminate between the value of contributions to literature and of those solely to the illumination of her subject. Her independence comes out in many places, and not least in her treatment of Goldsmith. She proves, for example, that in spite of the authorities, his portrayal of *The Deserted*

²⁶ *The English Village, A Literary Study, 1750-1850*, by Julia Patton, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1919. xi + 236 pp. \$1.50.

Village represented what was actually happening all over the country. This fact does not blind her to the truth that his idyllic Auburn gives more 'aesthetic enjoyment', and that the 'didactic motive' of the poem is rightly put in the background by lovers of poetry. 'Yet for the student of literature in its historical significance . . . it is important also to relate the poem to that body of fact which research in English social history has within the last ten years brought to view.'

Many of her conclusions are equally convincing, but it is impossible to detail them at equal length. We may perhaps find room for one more, which casts light on much of the poetry written between 1750 and 1850: 'Literature, which always lags behind events, long persisted in picturing the old order, and it is the old village which in the very days of its disappearance from the land, came into a new life in the literature of the nation.'

Mr. Chancellor's book on *The Eighteenth Century in London*²⁷ contains a remarkable series of illustrations, principally reproduced from the works of contemporary artists, thus 'enabling us to see the seventeenth century through the eyes of those who lived and laboured during the period'. Here we may enter the pleasure resorts of the day, Ranelagh, Vauxhall, or Bagnigge Wells; we may visit fairs and markets, and executions, view election scenes, water-pageants and processions, contrast London streets and houses of the time with those of our own period, form part of the audience at Covent Garden Theatre, or of the congregation at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields—in short, share in every activity of 'the town' when London was, as never before or since, the centre of English national life.

It is not altogether Mr. Chancellor's fault that his letter-press is relatively unimportant when thus brought into rivalry with the work of Hogarth, Rowlandson, Samuel Scott, Canaletto, Dayes, Sandby, and many other famous artists. He has collected plates which provide a lifelike background for students of the century, who owe him a tribute of thanks for the success which has crowned his labours.

²⁷ *The Eighteenth Century in London: an Account of its Social Life and Arts*, by E. Beresford Chancellor. B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1920. vii + 271 pp. 191 illustrations. 35s. net.

His own account of the century is divided into eight chapters, dealing respectively with social life, street topography, pleasure resorts, clubs, coffee-houses and taverns, great houses and public buildings, churches, the arts, and architectural relics of the period. Here, too, he relies to a large extent on contemporary sources of information, and the reader of the book is thus put in a position to draw his own conclusions about the social conditions of the time, and to consult for himself the authorities to whom Mr. Chancellor refers. From this point of view also the volume is a valuable possession.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

I

1800-1860,

[By C. H. HERFORD]

I. GENERAL WORKS

IN *A Survey of English Literature, 1830-80*,¹ as in its predecessor, his 'Survey' of our literature from 1780 to 1830, Professor Oliver Elton approaches and presents literature in a fashion which, on this scale, is new. Instead of a 'literary history' of the half-century, with critical remarks thrown in, his book is, primarily, a continuous and systematic critical appreciation of the literature, with just so much background of literary history as, since Sainte-Beuve at least, it is a commonplace that just and final criticism requires. And with this salutary tightening-up of method goes a greater stringency in the conception of literature itself, a stringency never out of place, but quite imperative in any coherent 'survey' of the huge welter of nineteenth-century writing. De Quincey countered one of its standing dilemmas by his distinction between 'the literature of knowledge' and 'the literature of power'. Professor Elton better satisfies the postulate that literature, in any worthy sense, must display power, and power of *writing*, by his introduction of the term 'applied literature' for books which, while possessing the vital quality of 'form', without which they would not, for him, be literature at all, seek, as philosophy, science, or scholarship, to convey information or to influence action. The *Divine Comedy* and some other supreme things will always confound these categories, and in an age teeming with ideas and deeply aware of urgent needs, like

¹ *A Survey of English Literature (1830-1880)*. By Oliver Elton. 2 vols. E. Arnold. xvi + 434 & xi + 432 pp.

that here in question, the conception of 'pure' literature as creative art is apt to strain a little, as it were, at the leash; so many of the greatest writers 'applied' their creative art not purely for art's sake. Mr. Elton finds, in fact, that 'applied' and 'pure' literature were nearly balanced in this period, and that this proximate balance is one of its characteristic traits. Certainly the twelve (out of his twenty-six) chapters given to 'applied' literature illustrate admirably, what is apparent throughout the book, the large good sense and versatility of critical perception, which guide his handling of these and other distinctions, and secure him from the pitfalls to which they allure. Thus, while his dislike of 'preaching' is patent, and his interest in 'ideas' plainly does not equal his interest in style, his insistence upon art is no Rossettian religion of the studio; he accepts 'the intellectual stir of the time', and even its 'reforming passion', as forces which not merely 'overflow' but 'extend' the artist's territory, and even 'prompt the inventions of new literary forms'. 'The condition-of-England question', as Carlyle uncouthly called it, and the enthusiasm of humanity, are on the whole good for literature, and put blood into its veins. Yet, on a total view, the influence of these 'excitements, indignations, ideals, and speculations' is, particularly in poetry, exceptional.

Two other traits which Mr. Elton finds characteristic of these fifty years are clearly connected with this insurgence, if one may use the figure, of 'applied' literature, though very far from being confined to it: the 'swift and splendid development of the art of prose', and a 'pervading nobility of temper'. Both judgements are those of no Victorian apologist but of a discriminating critic, sufficiently near, by birth and training, to the Victorians to understand them, and sufficiently detached, by ripe and many-sided culture, to see them objectively. Much of the most sterling and lasting work in these volumes revises both the earlier and the later type of judgement, by the simple process of approaching a writer with no other bias than an exacting literary taste, and with a palate sensitive to many kinds of literary excellence. Good examples are found in the case of men who, like Macaulay, Froude, or Carlyle, have suffered both from idolatries and from iconoclasm. Arnold called Macaulay's style 'metallic', and the epithet stuck. Mr. Elton feels it as much as any one else, and

he adopts the criticism, but with a comment which at once deepens its grip, limits its scope, and alters its complexion:

'Turn from a plain natural writer of the higher kind like Goldsmith, . . . and you may feel that Macaulay's sentences are fed out of a machine: a wonderful machine, because it is the very mind of the man. . . . Yet this is only the style in its lowest terms. There is, it is true, a certain framework of rhetoric and rhythm . . . out of which Macaulay seldom escapes. It has the merit of being wholly natural to him; it is not a thing learnt or affected, though it may be thought by the enemy to be all the more fatal for that. But, within that framework, it is one of the most skilful, and also of the most varied, of styles. For one thing, its abruptness of effect is often a mere matter of punctuation. The short snappy-seeming clauses are not really isolated, but unite into an harmonious group that satisfies the ear as a whole, and only as a whole; they are the minor ups and downs in a long rolling wave.'

Grote, in many obvious senses a bad writer, is a severer test, and Mr. Elton does not spare his defects:

'Herodotus becomes heavy in hand, and "the condensed and burning phrases of Thucydides", as Grote calls them, lose their virtue. Yet somehow we read Grote, and that not merely for his matter. He swings along in an ugly, powerful stride. The greatness of the subject does get into his language. . . . He had never been to Greece; he does not describe scenery; like all his school, he rather thinks than sees; yet he communicates the passion of the scene.'

On a much lower level, Mr. Elton's unfailing eye for good writing singles out the virtue of men like the painter Haydon, in whom it is swamped, in general repute, by their vanity and other absurd qualities. 'Haydon [in his autobiography], unlike most painters, often finds the only right words for his visual impressions'—with instances from his wonderful discriminations of the eyes of O'Connell and Brougham—where the trained perception of the painter clearly counted for much.

And if we turn to the highest levels of all, it is through his eye for good writing, admirably supple and comprehensive as it is, that Mr. Elton's work is most individual. Needless to say, his Carlyle superbly vindicates the great Thomas from what yet remains of the flood of cheap and insolent disparagement let loose by Froude. Needless to say, either, that his handling of

Carlyle's 'ideas', and the complex story of the German infiltrations, and the Puritan staple, say in *Sartor*, is scholarly and able in a high degree, if somewhat, but not too obviously, from the outside. Yet he is perhaps even more serviceable in passages of this kind, where he is tracing the less obtrusively Carlylean features of Carlyle's style:

'He is a master of prose that is just doing the day's work of prose; and his indescribable nerve and virility give him an advantage over more reserved and finished writers, like Thackeray and Newman, of his own time. He has, when all is said, a better eye and a better mind than most of them, and he gives a stronger satisfaction. Genius, like generalship, is not all grand strategy; much of it comes down to a series of small strokes, each of them going an inch further than mere talent can manage.'

Or where he is contrasting the 'mannerisms' of Carlyle, which are 'everywhere his own, himself', with the imitated mannerisms of the followers of Macaulay, the trick of a hundred journalists: 'There is more style, more literature, in an ounce of Carlyle, than in a ton of such work'. The academic critic is commonly repelled by Carlyle's stylistic oddities, the plain enthusiast scornfully dismisses the inquiry into the 'style' of a seer as vain; Mr. Elton's critical sense has been moulded by the finest academic culture to discern virtue utterly beyond the academic pale. Nothing short of this critical *humanitas*, at once schooled and open-minded, erudite and free, could have sufficed for the adequate 'survey' of such a field as this. And it pervades and informs the whole book.

The poetry of the period clearly, as has been said, does not overshadow the prose, as it did in the previous generation, but it asks at least as much acute discernment from the critic of style. Browning, like Meredith, has many notes that vibrate for the twentieth century; but the Victorian idol Tennyson has suffered some damage, and a former lecture by Mr. Elton himself bore evidence of that 'reaction'. His discussion in the present book modifies that attitude, while leaving it, naturally, far on this side of idolatry. The union in Tennyson of something primeval and elemental in mind and character with an immensely curious, brilliant, and versatile artistry makes the study

of his work full of reward for the discriminating student of style. Mr. Elton notes, for instance, 'the struggle' (in the poet of the thirties), 'or rather now, the fusion, between his instinct for complexity and his instinct for simplicity. In *Tithonus* the former rules; but in *Ulysses* the latter rules; 'the heroic style, in its plainness and strength', but with moments (as in the 'experience' image) of 'his spontaneous intricacy of musical metaphor', and his 'full, cunning vowelling'. Among many other instances of happy observation may be noted the distinction between the self-consciousness of Tennyson, as an artist, and that of Milton, who, 'intensely as he studies his form, forgets himself more often than Tennyson does in the passion or exaltation of his subject'; or, though this is more obvious, between the 'immense luck' of Browning's finest strokes, and Tennyson's waiting and watching for perfection, which, when found, misses something that the other's 'happy gambling' achieved.

The last third of the book is given to the Novel, admittedly the kind of creative literature in which the English mind of this period found its most congenial field, and reached its widest and perhaps most lasting vogue. The number of novels of a quality to demand notice in a Survey so largely planned as this, was, during these fifty years, formidably large; and only those who have tried to grapple with similar problems of sifting and assaying can do justice to a critical record which never becomes vague, or dry, or second-hand, or schematic, or journalistic, or weakly indulgent, or cruelly severe. Dickens and Thackeray test a critic's power to be fresh in dealing with the most beaten themes; George Eliot, his power of controlling and revising contemporary and fashionable bias. What is most distinctive is, as before, the treatment of style; now in discriminative analysis of manners, in talk or description, dialogue or comment (so marked in George Eliot); now its psychological effect upon the sensitive reader, or again upon the writer himself, hypnotized with his own art: to give but one example:

All distinctions between the clay, the rubble, the Porian marble and the Parian, in Thackeray, tend to be hidden by his good English, which gives him his smooth unbroken *façade*, and too easily keeps us quiet. Writers like Dickens warn us at once of their bad work by their bad writing.

It may be added that at numerous points in these volumes Mr. Elton applies in an interesting way the analysis of prose rhythms discussed by him in a valuable *English Association* essay, as previously by Professor Saintsbury.

But lest the impression should have been given that this 'Survey' deals but cursorily with the matters of moment in literature which lie outside style, let us conclude with these few sentences on Thackeray and Tolstoy—not a hackneyed comparison:

'The passion for seeing things truly, and the transparent style that goes along with it, and this observant humanity and breadth of scale, we find alike in Thackeray and Tolstoy. . . . Thackeray has his own advantages; among them is a far more pervasive wit and humour. . . . Nor is he burdened with the wrong sort of conscience or intellect. . . . He is a portrayer, not a theorist. All this may consist with excellent art, and may even be to the good; in George Eliot we see how philosophical luggage may harm a novelist. But, after all, such art can hardly be so deep or strong as the art which, like that of Tolstoy in his good days, can really carry the luggage. We have but to look at Prince Andreï lying wounded after Austerlitz, with his sense of the secret of the infinite skies above him, . . . or at Pierre, in the masonic lodge, feeling the new birth of human sympathy in his heart; to see what a world of real experience lies outside Thackeray's calculations. Nor is it simply the world of the mystical intellect.'

This is not, in the ordinary sense, a review; but we may be permitted to salute, in conclusion, the 'Surveyor' who has coped single-handed with the entire momentous century of English letters which lies behind us, and has made especially the last fifty years of it, where fewer had gone before him, at least as accessible and as fruitful both to the student and to the discoverer as any previous age of our literature.

In *L'Évolution psychologique et la Littérature en Angleterre, 1660-1914*,² Professor L. Cazamian offers a confessedly tentative, but masterly, sketch of the 'psychology' of our national development, the most important sections of which bear upon this period. M. Cazamian's book on the *Roman social en Angleterre 1830-1850* (1904) is already a classic; the present volume, slighter in

² Paris: Félix Alcan. 269 pp. 12 fr.

appearance because it deals with laws and tendencies and only incidentally with concrete facts, presupposes detailed studies no less thorough and precise, and the same fruitful alliance of the analyst of society, in industry and politics, and the analyst of mind, in literature and art. The attempt to reduce the 'interior development' of a literature to law is not new, and is in England with some reason suspect; the two celebrated French enterprises of this kind, those of Taine and Brunetière, have both, as M. Cazamian says, proved ephemeral. But the need of clear lines in the welter of detail remains urgent, and every survey of the literary history of a period or of a people makes some kind of attempt, mostly with insufficient apparatus, to provide them. It would be irrelevant, in this section, to discuss M. Cazamian's method of procedure at large. It will suffice to say that he discovers in our national evolution a rhythmic progress, determined by an alternate dominance of the emotional and the intellectual factors of mind. The former is the psychological base or ground-tone of the 'Romantic' periods—the age of the Elizabethans, of Wordsworth and Byron, and finally of the anti-intellectualist reaction of our own day. The latter is the psychological base of the intervening periods, the 'Classical' or 'Augustan' age of Pope, and the 'Victorian' return to convention and realism. But the simplicity of this rhythmic pattern is disturbed and complicated by social, political, economic factors, and the distinction and importance of M. Cazamian's book lies in his subtle and lucid interpretation of the intricate play of these disparate forces. Thus the industrial revolution of the later eighteenth century, though wholly remote from the incipient Romanticism of literature, yet contributed to the break-up of the old social order which is presupposed in Wordsworth and Shelley. And while Romanticism everywhere took the form of impassioned revolt against convention or against law, the cause of political and economic freedom and 'laissez-faire' was championed by hardheaded reasoners, the Godwins and Benthamites later to be denounced by the great Romantic Carlyle, and in their own day, but in the name of an inflexible conservatism, by the great pre-Romantic Burke. But Romanticism itself, across whose origins and growth these cross-currents played, culminated not in any logical process, but in Wordsworth's discovery of the emotional power over heart, thought, and

conduct resident in common things and in common words; so that the 'simplicity' which he preaches and practises is a 'penetrating and penetrated simplicity', 'a spiritual exaltation which multiplies the expressive coefficient of terms, or what is the same thing, the coefficient of suggestion of things, by heightening the mean tone of perception and emotion in the soul'. The traits which separate the 'second generation of Romanticism' from the first—Shelley and Keats and Byron from Wordsworth and Coleridge, are firmly and delicately traced. M. Cazamian will hear nothing of the view which regards Shelley as a beautiful anomaly in the England of his day; on the contrary, while 'Byron was a Romantic better adapted to continental than to native taste, and Keats a Romantic without parallel anywhere, Shelley was the English Romantic'. For (as is excellently pointed out) it is a trait of the English race 'to transcend, at rare and supreme moments, in accessions of mystic exaltation, the positive and utilitarian preoccupations of its daily thought. No one ever carried these accessions further or higher than Shelley'.

As the 'evolution' approaches our own time, the elements become more entangled, and their apparent relations more illusory. But the history of the 'transitional' years 1830-50—the subject of M. Cazamian's more detailed work—and of the 'Mid-Victorian' neo-classicism, rationalism, and realism, which culminates and closes towards 1880, gain in clearness from his analysis, though the clearness results not from simplification but from a precise articulation of complicated facts.

Walter Graham, *Politics of the Greater Romantic Poets* (Publ. Mod. L. Ass., xxxvi. 1), passes briefly in review the political utterances of Wordsworth, Coleridge and Southey, Scott, Byron, and Shelley, distinguishing the shades in the Toryism of the three first, and the Liberalism of the two last, and concluding that all were less interested in local and temporary affairs than in what Coleridge called 'the permanent politics of human nature'.

Although *Victorian Worthies*, by G. H. Blore³ is avowedly based mainly upon standard biographies, and designed for boys, it may properly claim a word of notice here. The

³ *Victorian Worthies*, by G. H. Blore. Oxford: The University Press. viii + 376 pp. 7s. 6d. net.

sixteen 'worthies' chosen for these concise and freshly written biographies have not all been the subject of monographs; information about several, as Lister, Patteson the missionary, and J. R. Green, is not easily accessible; of one, Morier, the famous ambassador at St. Petersburg in the eighties, no biography exists. The choice of men is dictated by a large apprehension of the varied kinds of power and self-devotion which were put to the service of England in the slighted Victorian age, and the separate biographies are preceded by a brief but excellent sketch of the characteristics of that age. Many more pretentious books make a less adequate introduction to it.

II. SINGLE WRITERS. I. WORDSWORTH⁴

In 1916 Professor Harper in his elaborate study of 'William Wordsworth' produced some previously unknown facts about the poet's life in France in 1791-2. In this brief treatise⁵ he proves conclusively that a daughter was born to him in Orleans on December 15, 1792, that she was acknowledged by him at baptism, and that the mother was Marie Anne Léonard, *dite* Vallon, who afterwards called herself Madame Vallon, though she never married. The daughter, with her father's formal consent, married under the name of Catherine Wordsworth, and became Madame Baudouin on February 20, 1816. Wordsworth and his wife and Dorothy Wordsworth all corresponded with and visited both mother and daughter, and many of Wordsworth's friends, among others Crabb Robinson, Mrs. Clarkson, Miss Hutchinson, Mr. and Mrs. Monkhouse, Helen Maria Williams (the minor novelist), knew the story, and some of them, Crabb Robinson for example, were acquainted with mother and daughter. There is no question that this early love-affair casts new light on Wordsworth's character and on the moral crisis through which he passed in 1792-3. Professor Harper explains the almost insuperable difficulties in the way of marriage between the

⁴ [The sections on Harper's *Wordsworth's French Daughter* and the new edition of Legouis' *Early Life of Wordsworth* are by Professor Edith Morley, and are transferred here from Chapter X.—Eds.]

⁵ *Wordsworth's French Daughter: the Story of her Birth with the Certificates of her Baptism and Marriage*, by George McLean Harper. Princeton University Press, and Oxford University Press, 1921. 41 pp. 4s. 6d. net.

young English revolutionary, with his Protestant upbringing, and the French Catholic Royalist, who refused to accept the decree of July 12, 1790, which made the priests servants of the State. He cannot explain why Wordsworth married Mary Hutchinson in 1802, just after his visit to Annette and her child. That Mary was acquainted with the story at the time we are assured. Mr. Harper adds, and every one must agree with his statement: 'What seems almost unbelievable and can indeed only be explained on the ground that Mrs. Wordsworth was a woman of extraordinary magnanimity and that he (Wordsworth) inspired in her a sense of his own goodness, is the fact that she, with a company of relatives and friends, should have been willing to visit Annette.'

The chief importance of the story to students of literature is that it finally does away with the absurd supposition that Wordsworth was not acquainted with the passion of love, and corroborates his own statement: 'But me has Nature tamed'. He had deliberately overcome his turbulent nature in order that mystic insight might be his. He was neither cold nor calm in disposition, and he gained self-control as he gained his knowledge of nature, first by active effort and only afterwards by the 'wise passiveness' of the seer.

Professor Legouis' *Early Life of Wordsworth*⁶ is well known to English readers as an admirable study of the development of the poet's mind. Not even Mr. Harper's more recent work has superseded this detailed and sympathetic treatment of the subject, and the new edition with its additional appendix is assured of a welcome. M. Legouis has not appreciably altered the text of his work, which therefore does not call for further description here, but in his appendix he has incorporated an account of Mr. Harper's discoveries about the liaison with Annette and the birth of her daughter, together with the consequent modifications he feels constrained to make in some of the statements in his book. These modifications refer mainly to the account of the *Descriptive*

⁶ *The Early Life of Wordsworth, 1770-1798; a Study of The Prelude*, by Émile Legouis, translated by J. W. Matthews, with a Prefatory Note by Leslie Stephen. J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1921 (1st edition, 1897). xvi + 480 pp. 10s. 6d. net.

Sketches, the melancholy of which is now seen to be genuine. Wordsworth felt and, as he thought of Annette, had reason to feel 'Conscience dogging close his bleeding way'. Secondly, it becomes clear that, for all his reticence, the young poet had other than political interests during his sojourn in France, and, thirdly and most important, that, as De Quincey stated, Wordsworth's intellectual passions were founded on a 'preternatural animal sensibility', 'diffused through *all* the animal passions (or appetites)'. There is in Wordsworth's *Prelude* no 'picture of passionate love, not because he could not paint it, . . . but because he *would* not tell his own experiences, and also because the affections (not the passions) and the purified senses were the basis of his optimistic doctrine'.

Professor Legouis relegates the new facts about Wordsworth to an appendix because, so he tells us, he has since made fresh discoveries which he proposes to publish separately. In the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for April and May, 1922, he gives the results of his further investigations, and though discussion of them must be held over until the next issue of the *Year's Work*, this bare reference may be useful to those interested in the matter.

In *The Story of Wordsworth's Cintra* (*Studies in Philology*, January, 1921), Professor J. E. Wells gives the first adequate account of the genesis, the composition, and the intricate bibliography of Wordsworth's great Tract. The article is of capital importance and quality, clearing up and stating in complete and precise detail matters unsuspected or only vaguely surmised by the previous editors Grosart, Knight, and Dicey. The most important of these is the detection of the passage, occupying about two columns of the *London Courier*, contributed by Coleridge to his friend's work (as stated by him to Poole, letter, February 3, 1809). It begins on p. 126, l. 10, and ends at p. 131 of Knight's edition. It is one of the finest examples of Coleridge's unequal prose. The occasion for it was the loss of several sheets in the London printing-office in the previous December. As related by Coleridge in a letter to the editor, 'William received your letter this morning at eleven o'clock. We have been hard at work ever since. It is now nearly three

in the morning. However, the Essay has probably benefited by the accident. At all events it has been increased in size.' This 'increase in size' was, precisely, as is now shown, the effect of Coleridge's contribution. Further complications, here also for the first time unravelled, were introduced by the commission given to De Quincey, then, at twenty-four, on intimate terms with the Wordsworth family, to supervise the printing of the Tract in its later stages, in view of the impracticable Grasmere postal service. This third person in the little drama—a tragic-comedy—appears to have supplemented Wordsworth's defective punctuation by an original system of his own and otherwise given the nascent Tract the benefit of a mind amusingly characterized by Coleridge as 'anxious yet dilatory, confused from over-accuracy, and at once systematic and labyrinthine'. The most important event in this chapter of the story was the sending of a long passage, on March 25, owing to a change in the public circumstances, for insertion. This passage (beginning p. 246 in Knight's edition) contains about one-sixth of the entire work. It includes the grandest statement of the passionate faith in national freedom which inspired the Tract and which led Dicey to reprint it at the opening of the Great War. The article closes with a minute tabulation of the variations in the extant copies of the text.

In his essay on *Sentimental Morality in Wordsworth's Narrative Poetry* (*University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 11), Mr. O. J. Campbell studies with much penetration the purpose of the usually tragic or melancholy themes of Wordsworth's narratives. It has commonly been supposed that Wordsworth means to emphasize the happiness of unsullied nature by contrast with human misfortune and sin. Mr. Campbell points out the evidence that Wordsworth's animus was rather that of the sentimental humanitarianism which he learned from Hartley's *Observations on Man*. 'Hartley gave a central place in his moral systems to compassion for undeserved human suffering. He regarded it as one of the principal incentives to a life of joyous virtue. Wordsworth found in this theory the highest philosophical sanction for the employment of one of his most characteristic mental qualities. Godwin's contempt for pity which was awakened by human misery served

at this time (when he had outgrown Godwin's influence) only to commend the more urgently this doctrine. . . . He therefore began to write a kind of poetry which he had not attempted before. He retained his interest in the common man, but he no longer presented his condition as one to invite the reform of rational humanitarians. He made him the object of compassion by showing his enduring with fortitude undeserved suffering; he gave the reader authentic instances of the reformation of every human being by the sight of virtue in distress.'

This view is then applied in detail. The essay is a contribution of great value to Wordsworth-interpretation.

In *Wordsworth's Interpretation of Nature* (Hibbert Journal, April 1921), Dr. J. P. Lilley restates with freshness and acumen the poet's philosophy of Man, Nature, and God, affirms its consonance at all points with rational Christianity, and defends it from the charge that it is pantheistic, mythological, or otherwise either unchristian or unscientific. The 'something far more deeply interfused' of Tintern Abbey is not immanent God but 'the Soul of the World in the shape of Ideal Beauty' (as in the *Recluse* Fragment) 'employed by the Creator in His ministrations to humanity'. Wordsworth's frequent references to 'Powers' and 'Spirits' receive a theological interpretation sometimes strained if not untenable. But Dr. Lilley has the key to the whole problem of Nature's influence on Man when he quotes Goethe's *Gott und Welt* to the effect that 'the core of Nature is in the human heart'. 'Since man is a part of this system as well as its head, there can be no gulf between him and Nature, but rather a reciprocal activity.'

II. LANDOR

Mr. Stanley T. Williams (*Publ. Mod. L. Ass.* xxxvi. 4), dealing with 'the story of Gebir', makes probable that Landor's only source was Clara Reeve's 'History of Charoba, queen of Egypt', a free translation from Vattier's French version of an Arabic MS. in the Mazarin Library. On the publication of the poem, it was described by reviews as 'nothing more than a version of an Arabian Tale'. Landor on his part affirmed that it had not a sentence or a sentiment in common with the Tale.

Mr. Williams examines the matter in detail, and finds that neither statement is justified.

III. SCOTT

In *The Intimate Life of Sir Walter Scott*,⁷ Mr. Archibald Stalker attempts to deliver the really memorable man, Scott, from the incubus of the wearisome novelist and the imitation-poet. 'Waverley' and 'County Guy' and the rest are faded; but the record of their author's 'joyous personal life' has 'lost not a shade of its brightness', and has, moreover, 'never before been told as a consecutive narrative'. The biography claims to be not only 'new', but specially fitted to the taste of the twentieth century, and thus unavoidably unlike the accounts which satisfied the nineteenth, though it may itself, Mr. Stalker modestly admits, be displeasing to the twenty-first. Lockhart himself was chiefly 'a compiler', who made his book out of Scott's letters and journals, so that that famous biography is in reality Scott's own book, and his best. The 'twentieth century', so far, certainly shows a pronounced taste for the personal note, and there is little in Mr. Stalker's buoyant and effusive pages of the self-suppression which, in his eyes, disqualifies Lockhart, and even Boswell, for the highest rank in biography; he significantly prefers to either the fearless candour of Mr. Pepys. For the rest, the 'intimate life' of Scott was certainly rich and varied enough to bear detachment, and here and there Mr. Stalker has been able to add interesting traits from sources, such as Crabb Robinson's Diary, not available for Lockhart. In successive chapters he deals with Scott's parents, his 'first love'—hitherto slurred over, he thinks, by Scott's biographers—his 'family life', 'a day at Abbotsford', 'Tom Purdie', 'Scott as a literary man', 'his social and political views', 'his personality', and in much detail, 'the Ballantynes and Businesses'. Mr. Stalker has the realist's eye for matters of outward fact, and finds his account in a subject so rich in them as the life of Scott. He is less remarkable either for psychological or for literary insight; and we surmise that, in

⁷ *The Intimate Life of Sir Walter Scott*. By Archibald Stalker. viii+207 pp. Black. 10s. 6d. net.

spite of their reticence and their preoccupation with the perishable labours of the pen, Lockhart and even the Victorian Hutton will still be read.

IV. LAMB

It will suffice to mention that Mr. E. V. Lucas's well-known *Life of Lamb* (1905)⁸ has appeared in a fifth edition revised. It is 'similar to the original edition, save for the omission of illustrations and four appendices, and the addition of certain corrections and a few new passages'.

V. BYRON

Of *Astarte*, by the late Earl of Lovelace,⁹ originally issued in a very small, practically private, edition in 1905, and now published with additions by the widow of the author, a very few words will suffice. Though pretentious and badly written, and full of irrelevant quasi-critical matter, *Astarte* contained documentary evidence, in letters both of Byron and of Mrs. Leigh, which left no doubt of their guilt. The new edition reproduces the original matter, slightly annotated and better arranged, with the addition of three chapters containing 'additional letters' between Lady Byron, Mrs. Leigh, and Mrs. Villiers, and between Mrs. Leigh and Byron, which bear out the truth of the miserable story.

In a powerful and eloquent essay, *Lord Byron*,¹⁰ Arturo Farinelli trenchantly assails the conventional fame of Byron, still vigorously flourishing in Italy. To English readers the book will appeal chiefly by its fresh presentation of Byron's poetic personality as seen from this, to them relatively familiar, angle. There are interesting side-lights—Byron as he appeared to Goethe, Alfred de Vigny, Michelet, Mazzini, and Bismarck, and comparisons with Leopardi and Alfieri. He traverses Byron's claim to be a liberator in these terms: 'Can he lead men to true

⁸ *The Life of Charles Lamb*. By E. V. Lucas. Methuen. 2 vols. 960 pp. 21s. net.

⁹ *Astarte*. A Fragment of Truth concerning George Gordon Byron, Sixth Lord Byron. Recorded by his grandson, Ralph Milbanke, Earl of Lovelace. New edition by Mary, Countess of Lovelace. Christophers. xxix + 363 pp. 18s. net.

¹⁰ Arturo Farinelli. *Lord Byron. Saggio*. Milano: Caddeo. 87 pp. 4 lire.

liberty, this British lord, self-absorbed, a perpetual prey to the most vehement passions, without firm convictions, without a beacon-light to shine before him, or a message to accomplish? Is not the rushing vehemence, which he had in common with Alfieri, confused with the love and humanity that glow in strong and constant spirits, who can radiate this their inner fire, and awaken the slumbering energies in the lowly, so that their chains fall from them, and the oppressed soul rise to the light and the sun?' The distinction is just and finely put. But a subtler criticism would admit qualifications even here. Signor Farinelli's drawing is too deficient in light and shade to do full justice to a personality so intricately and elusively mingled as Byron's.

VI. SHELLEY

In his lecture, *Shelley and Calderón*, since published in a volume with other essays,¹¹ Señor Salvador de Madariaga, a Spaniard settled in England, has given the first illuminating discussion of the significance for Shelley of his acquaintance with the work of the Spanish dramatist, the object, as we know, of his ardent study and almost boundless admiration from the summer of 1819 to the end. After quoting the familiar passages bearing on this from Shelley's correspondence and Mary's journals, Mr. Madariaga deals in a very fresh and interesting way with the apparent paradox of his devotion to dramas permeated by an inflexible Catholic orthodoxy, and not chiefly to those among them which, like the *Alcalde de Zalamea*, have a kind of democratic appeal, but to the mystic and sacramental Autos, the whole series of which he read again and again. The Spanish critic finds a bond of union in the passionate dogmatism of both poets. 'Both . . . saw man, not on the moving screen of time, but against the immovable background of eternity.' In both, imagination, accordingly, 'tends to soar away from the earth and to keep immaculate a dazzling whiteness of intellectual light'. They love weird and fantastic scenery, 'rocks, crags, and precipices'—as in the 'melancholy mountain' passage in *The Cenci*, borrowed from *El Magico*

¹¹ *Shelley and Calderón, and other essays on English and Spanish poetry.* By Salvador de Madariaga. Constable. 197 pp. 15s. net.

Prodigioso when Shelley had scarcely studied Calderón two months. Peculiarly congenial to Shelley, as his language shows, was Calderón's sensuous yet æthereal and unearthly imagery. 'I am bathing myself in the light and odour of the flowery and starry Autos.' But Calderón's way of arranging his images, in symmetrical groups followed by a kind of climax in which they are summarily resumed, is definitely un-English and un-Shelleyan. Mr. Madariaga's most original and valuable point is that Shelley, nevertheless, felt the charm of this symmetrical mode of lyric, and in one of his own greatest lyrics, *The Ode to the West Wind*, frankly adopted it. The plan of the first four stanzas is purely Calderónesque. The essay contains much other scattered observation of value about Shelley, with some, rather less penetrating, about Shakespeare and Matthew Arnold.

It may suffice to refer to the closing essay in the volume—*The Case of Wordsworth*, a very lively and piquant, but not really judicial, examination of Wordsworth's claims to be a great poet.

In a useful article (*P. M. L. A.* xxxvi. 3) Mr. Newman I. White shows that Shelley's burlesque drama, *Swell-foot the Tyrant*, stands in a closer relation to contemporary English satire on the same subject than had yet been established. Some of these sources are ignored by all Shelley's commentators, and Dowden did not perceive their full bearing. Mr. White adduces and quotes examples of the savage (but merited) satires and pamphlets directed during 1820 against the husband of Queen Caroline, and shows that Shelley borrowed largely from these anonymous productions in both manner and ideas. Definite originals are also established for four of the persons in the play—Mammon, the Leech, the Gadfly, and the Rat, who stand respectively for Lord Liverpool, Vice-Chancellor Leach, William Cooke, a lawyer, and Lt.-Colonel Browne, a shady agent of the King, often dubbed the 'Brown rat'.

In an article on *Shelley and the Abbé Barruel* (*P. M. L. A.* xxxvi. 3), Mr. W. E. Peck throws light upon Shelley's use of a little-known book, by the Abbé, which he is known from his correspondence to have read, in an English translation. This

was the Abbé's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobitisme*, a bitter and prejudiced account of the men and ideas of the Revolution, with abundant illustrative excerpts from Voltaire, Rousseau, Weishaupt, and others. Shelley, while denouncing the Abbé's 'falsehoods', eagerly read the excerpts in the formative period which preceded *Queen Mab*, and Mr. Peck traces the effect of some of them in that and later works. The account (in vol. ii) of the Zoroastrian system was perhaps the source of the knowledge of it, surprising at that date, displayed in the *Prometheus Unbound*. Shelley's copy of Barruel, with his autograph, dated 1810, apparently remained at Field Place and passed into the possession of his father's neighbour, William Sandham, a descendant of whom described it in *Notes and Queries*, 10th February, 1917.

VII. KEATS

The *John Keats Memorial Volume*,¹² published on the centenary of the poet's death, 23rd Feb. 1921, consists of about a hundred contributions of very unequal character and importance. It opens with Professor E. de Sélincourt's Warton Lecture on Keats, an eloquent restatement of the ideas unfolded in the Introduction to his well-known edition of the Poems. Nearly one-fourth are from the continent, or the East, including *éloges* or verse translations in Sanskrit, Persian, and several Indian dialects, by enthusiastic native scholars. Only one of these, gratifying as they are, has any definite bearing on English studies—a note by Professor Hoops of Heidelberg, pointing out the resemblance of the opening lines of *Endymion* to Bacon's ideal in the *Essay on Gardens*, of a garden devised for all the months of the year, 'in which severally *things of beauty* may be then in season'.

The English contributions include a number of verse-tributes, the frequent merit (and occasional almost incredible demerit) of which is not relevant to the present purpose. To the same category may be assigned the glowing prose of General Ian Hamilton—a cry of noble passion with no bearing (unless for its moving and eloquent pathos) on English studies, and very

¹² *The John Keats Memorial Volume*, issued by the Keats House Committee

little on Keats. The pieces which here come into question may be distinguished according as they relate (1) to the text, (2) to the exegesis of particular poems, or (3) to particular aspects of the poetry or the life.

(1) First in interest of these is the Letter, hitherto unknown, written by Keats to Woodhouse, 22nd Sept., 1819, and enclosing the *Ode to Autumn*, then just composed. The present owner, the poet Miss Amy Lowell, bought it twenty years ago in a bound volume of Keats's Letters. It is a long letter, in the writer's most whimsical vein for the most part, but containing, besides the *Autumn*, and fragments from *Hyperion*, then on the stocks, incidental criticisms of *Isabella*, *St. Agnes' Eve*, and *Lamia*. Of greater intrinsic interest is Sir Sidney Colvin's account of the autograph MS. of the *Nightingale Ode*, discovered early in the present century and now in the possession of the Marquess of Crewe (*A Morning's Work in a Hampstead Garden*). Minute scrutiny of the paper and the writing discloses slight inaccuracies in Brown's well-known narrative, and quite disposes of Haydon's assertion that Keats recited the Ode to him 'before it was committed to paper', the MS. (here, photographically reproduced) showing that its final form was reached by way of numerous and important corrections. Sir Sidney's discussion of them, and of the diverse working of Keats's poetic mind which they disclose, is full of delicate observation.

(2) The most important exegetical essays deal with the still fluid problems involved in the revised *Hyperion*. Mr. L. Abercrombie gives greater precision to the thesis, generally accepted, that the original *Hyperion* was abandoned for reasons more fundamental than dissatisfaction with its 'Miltonic inversions'; that the second *Hyperion* was an attempt to find poetic expression not merely, as hitherto, for the poet of impassioned senses and enchanted fantasy, but for the man of deep sympathies, keen intellect, and shrewd humour, revealed in the Letters; the third phase of the progress through the 'Vale of Soul-making' described in the famous *Letter XCII*. 'His art was on the verge of becoming adequate to the man.' Professor Ker in a brief pregnant note seeks a more purely technical solution for the *Hyperion* problem, and would explain the abandonment of *Hyperion* by the inherent inadequacy of his epic plan for a repre-

sentation of Apollo in his glory. 'In this vision, if he had gone further he might have told more, through an interpreter, of the new glories which he could not bring directly and fully into his epic poem.' But would not epic precedent have permitted his 'Interpreter' to relate, like Raphael or Odysseus, what could not be directly told?

In his *Note on the Composition of Endymion* Mr. Mackail applies the known data of Keats's journeys and residences during the summer and autumn of 1818—Carisbrook, Margate, Canterbury, Oxford, Hampstead—to the discovery of 'sources' or suggestions of descriptive passages in the poem. That the lawns and 'copse-clad valleys' of the Isle of Wight have counted for something is clear; it is perhaps more noteworthy that Canterbury and Oxford have counted for nothing at all. At Oxford, as the letters written thence show, some unexplained irritant neutralized the natural magic of the place; that Canterbury had after all left a deep impress appeared two years later in the *Eve of St. Mark's*.

Dr. Boas studies the sonnet *On First Looking into Chapman's Homer*, suggesting reminiscences of his first reading of it in the imagery of the sonnet himself.

(3) Among the essays on special aspects of Keats as a whole must be mentioned Dr. A. C. Bradley's study of *Keats and 'Philosophy'*. That his attitude to something which he calls by that name presents a problem is clear when we compare *Lamia* with the eagerness for 'metaphysic' apparent in his Letters; that his own gift (however unschooled) for philosophic thinking was by no means contemptible, the Letters make equally clear. Dr. Bradley presents afresh, with further developments, his view (*Oxford Lectures: 'The Letters of Keats'*) that Keats held from first to last his central affirmation that 'Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty', and that the intellectual change marked by the summer of 1818 and more explicitly by the *second Hyperion* meant not, as has been thought, a diminished acceptance of Beauty, but the recognition, in pain and evil, of a deeper, more 'difficult' beauty, for which it was the unfulfilled object of his later poetry to find adequate expression. Incidentally a traditional printer's error in the Letter to Reynolds (*love* for *lore*) receives certain correction.

The present writer (*Mountain-Scenery in Keats*), connecting the poet's first experience of 'grand' mountains in the summer of 1818 with the mental and spiritual development which followed, shows that in the den of the ruined Titans in *Hyperion* the Miltonic reminiscences otherwise to be expected have been replaced by the chasms of Ben Nevis.

Mr. Bailey (*The Poet of Stillness*) comments on the many passages where, as in the opening of *Hyperion* and of the *Grecian Urn*, 'quietness' is expressed with a magical intensity; connecting them with 'the passive, listening, watching, receiving attitude towards Nature' from which he meant to rise, and in vision though not in performance had finally risen, into the presence of the agonies and strifes of human hearts.

Personal reminiscences, finally, of Keats, through friends or relatives, are communicated by Mrs. Meynell, Mr. A. Howe, and Mr. Trevor Leigh Hunt.

The problem of the final phase of Keats, which engaged several contributors to the Memorial Volume, was handled with great penetration from a somewhat fresh point of view by Mr. G. R. Elliott, in *The Real Tragedy of Keats* (P. M. L. A. xxxvi, 3). Mr. Elliott's *datum* is the crisis in Keats's development produced by his endeavour to remould his poetry to the meaning of the larger and more philosophic apprehension of life which from 1818 had been rapidly ripening in him. The revised *Hyperion*, which resulted, did not, as poetry, justify the attempt. Most critics ascribe its failure to the combined operation of disease and morbid passion. Mr. Elliott thinks that the cause lay deeper. The richness of his nature impelled him to seek a synthesis in which poetry and philosophy and his fuller vision of human life would all have adequate scope and expression. But he was too heavily handicapped by circumstances—'the inadequacy of his associates, the superficiality of his understanding of the English classics, his ignorance of foreign thought'—ever to have achieved that synthesis. 'He craved without knowing it a philosophy of Goethean quality: a view of life which, while meeting nineteenth-century conditions, would be so complete and satisfying as to be fully soluble in serene beauty.' That his nature swiftly developed needs far larger

than his powers could fulfil was thus 'the real tragedy' of Keats. The question, so put, is speculative, and we think it overbold to assume that the uptaught thinker who shaped with such penetrating force and expressed with such lyric beauty a philosophic world view of his own, in the famous Letter XCII and elsewhere, would have finally failed to find a poetry adequate to his larger intellectual needs. But the inner obstacles which embarrassed his struggle towards full poetic expression before passion and disease finally frustrated it have never, we think, been more clearly seized or more powerfully stated.

Professor Notcutt's *The Story of Glaucus in Keats's 'Endymion'*¹³ continues a line of interpretation opened up by him in his earlier essay on *Endymion*. Believing that Keats intended the whole poem as an allegory of the history of poetry, he proposes to find in the story of Glaucus in Book III a symbolic reference to the rise of the Augustan classical school at the opening of the eighteenth century. Keats has diverged from Ovid's story of Glaucus (*Metamorph.* xiii-xiv) in several points, in order, it is suggested, to adapt it to this meaning. Glaucus, in Ovid, rejects the advances of Circe, who revenges herself by deforming his mistress Scylla. Keats, however, meant Glaucus to stand for the poetic impulse in England at the outset of the age of Pope, and Scylla for a poetical idea, beautiful in itself, but ineffective at that time; Circe is the malign force of the school of Pope denounced in 'Sleep and Poetry', intervening to seduce Glaucus and lay Scylla in a trance.* Circe, for Mr. Notcutt, actually stands for Pope, and the picture of the enchantress among her tusked or stinging victims is interpreted of the poet of the *Dunciad* and his throng of 'Dunces'. Pope had himself, in the *Bathos*, it is pointed out, classified the 'Dunces under animal types. Glaucus's later account (v. 645 f.) of the wreck, and the old man's scroll which, torn in pieces, Endymion fits into the face of Glaucus with enchanting effect, is interpreted of the revival of poetry by the agency of Percy's *Reliques*. In all this, there is much ingenuity, though not enough to avoid some severe straining of resemblances; but we think

¹³ *The Story of Glaucus in Keats's 'Endymion'*. By H. C. Notcutt. (Privately printed). 20 pp.

Mr. Notcutt, while rightly holding that the story of Glaucus is to be understood, like that of Endymion, in terms of the adventures of the poetic soul, does injustice to the imaginative reach of the poem by restricting the application to the events of a particular historic period.

Among minor contributions of interest to the constructive criticism of Keats may be mentioned Miss M. H. Shackford's article (*P. M. L. A.* xxxvi. 1) on *The Eve of St. Agnes* and *The Mysteries of Udolpho*. That Keats knew Mrs. Radcliffe's books, and held them in slight respect, is plain from a jesting letter to Reynolds: but the framework of the *St. Agnes* narrative is in many points of the Radcliffian brand, and eight passages are quoted which suggest, or do not exclude, conscious reminiscence; in particular, the chapel, the feeble old servant, the journey by tortuous passages through the castle, the chamber with painted window and moonlight, the lover's pleading, and the hurried flight. It may be added that the gross turn to the story given in Boccaccio's *Filocolo* (claimed as 'the source of *The Eve of St. Agnes*', by McCracken in *Mod. Philology* v) is equally absent from Mrs. Radcliffe's romance and from Keats's poem.

Dr. Burden-Sanderson's interesting *Keats Anthology* may also be recorded among the Centenary Tributes.

VIII. CLARE.

To a contemporary in humbler spheres both of life and of poetry, John Clare, tardy justice has now been done in the exemplary edition of his poems¹⁴ by Mr. Edmund Blunden and Mr. A. Porter. Both editors, in addition to the scholarship and care required in dealing with MS. material, have the rarer qualification of a gift of original verse akin in temper and preoccupation to Clare's own. A large amount of hitherto unedited material is included, and an illuminating introduction prefixed.

¹⁴ *The Poems of John Clare, chiefly from MSS.* Edited by E. Blunden and A. Porter. John Lane.

IX. CARLYLE

Mr. Augustus Ralli's *Guide to Carlyle*¹⁵ is modestly named, and runs some risk of slighting treatment because it supplements biography and criticism with detailed analyses of the whole of Carlyle's writings. But the book was originally undertaken, we are told, as a critical study, and the inclusion of methodical analyses was a later development. Mr. Ralli recognizes the inner continuity of Carlyle's thought, and his object is to make this easier for the readers of a generation in which he is apt to be a fading 'Victorian' memory, to disentangle the bewildering multiplicity of his thirty volumes of 'silence'. Mr. Ralli's 'Guide' is, thus a critical biography ranking in importance, we consider, with the best that have yet been produced, and presenting in far larger measure than any other the data of its conclusions. The analyses are so full (that of *Frederick*, for instance, alone occupying some 170 pages), and so competent, that any serious quarrel with them must take the form of a suspicion that the use of this excellently distilled essence of Carlyle may replace study of the original. But so much of the original reappears in the 'essence', that the suspicion is in great part disarmed.

M. Jean-Marie Carré's *Goethe en Angleterre*¹⁶ (a choice of subject for which he apologizes, very unnecessarily, to his countrymen) handles this important matter for the first time, we believe, with proximate completeness. He has chosen, however, to close the inquiry with Lewes's *Life* in 1855, merely sketching the important later example of Matthew Arnold, the most Goethean of all great English poets. In the story thus limited, Carlyle is the towering figure, and he occupies the entire second part of the three which compose the book. The pre-Carlylean influence, patiently recorded and interpreted, has little lasting importance. Before Byron and Shelley it was entangled with the damaging sentimentalisms of 'the German drama' and 'Tales of Terror'; Scott did not distinguish *Erkönig* from the productions of Monk Lewis, Lamb took *Faust* for a 'canting tale of seduction'. The Goethean influence upon Byron—made light

¹⁵ *A Guide to Carlyle*. By Augustus Ralli. 2 vols. Allen & Unwin. 42s.

¹⁶ *Goethe en Angleterre*. Par J.-M. Carré. Paris: Plon. 300 pp. 15 fr.

of by himself—is defined: Harold 'is not a son of Werther, but Manfred and Cain are kinsmen of Faust', and however inferior in epic and philosophic power 'the poem of the Universe' be to 'the poem of the ego', yet, as a character, Manfred is 'more living, pathetic, and heroic' than Faust. The five chapters devoted to Carlyle distinguish carefully his attitude to Goethe during the phases of his own growth, from the first article on *Faust*, in the pessimist days of the Leith-walk episode (1822), and the translation of *Meister*, to the essays, and *Sartor*, and the *Heroes*. That Carlyle incompletely apprehended Goethe, and his development, and that he was himself powerfully drawn only to the ethical thinker, is clearly shown. And even this Goethe gives place, step by step, to Fichte, whose glorified moral will was, in truth, more Carlylean than the older master's Olympian vision. It struck home to the primitive Puritan in him. 'Goethe saved Carlyle, but Carlyle, when saved, abandoned Goethe.'

The third part describes, not without merited sarcasm, the prolonged discreditable incapacity of English criticism either to grasp the plan and significance of *Faust* or to escape its fascination. *Paracelsus*, *Festus*, and *Dipsychus* are admirably discussed under this head. Less familiar are the indications of the influence of *Meister* upon Bulwer-Lytton and Disraeli. The closing pages emphasize the cosmopolitan and international significance of Goethe for the modern world, including M. Carré's own country. 'Goethe is our ally, not our enemy.' The question, not so easily answered in M. Carré's sense, is rather whether France is the ally, or the enemy, of Goethe. His book may do something, in time, to persuade her of the former alternative.

X. TENNYSON

In his monograph on *The Formation of Tennyson's style*¹⁷ (*University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 12), Professor J. F. A. Pyre has applied the statistical methods of literary analysis in vogue in America to a matter where, if ever, they are in place. The stylistic secrets of an

¹⁷ *The Formation of Tennyson's Style, A Study, primarily of the Versification of the early Poems.* Madison, 1921. 249 pp.

artist who calculates may be surprised by a calculating critic; and Tennyson is not only the nearest to us of the scanty band of deliberate and conscious artists among English poets, but unlike his two chief fellows, Milton and Gray, he has left ample and most illuminating material for critical study. Mr. Pyre has limited his field, in the main, first to versification, and then to the 'early poems'; the weight of the argument being given, rightly, to the study of the crucial process which converted the pregnant imperfection of 1830 and 1833 into the finished maturity of 1842. Much of this comparison has of course been done, by Churton Collins and others; but Mr. Pyre brings a new refinement and also a new precision into it. And in the excellent chapter called 'Mastering Blank Verse', he throws important light upon the processes by which Tennyson arrived at the noble epic music of *Morte d'Arthur* and *Ulysses*.

XI. A. BRONTË

Mr. Shorter's collection of *The Complete Poems of Anne Brontë*¹⁸ makes for the first time generally accessible all her known pieces. Of the total of fifty-four, twenty-four only were published by Anne herself. Charlotte chose seven more, after her death, for publication in a new edition of *Wuthering Heights* and *Agnes Grey*. The remaining twenty-three have for the most part appeared in limited editions only and are now reprinted for the first time. Mr. Hatfield supplies a brief 'bibliographical introduction' noticing the bearing of several of them upon her brief romance, cut short by the death of its object, the curate Weightman, and giving a minutely specific account of the publications in which the fifty-four poems severally appeared.

¹⁸ *The Complete Poems of Anne Brontë*. Edited by Clement Shorter, now for the first time collected, with a bibliographical Introduction by C. W. Hatfield. Hodder & Stoughton. xxiii + 153 pp. 12s. 6d.

XII

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

II

1860-1900

[By H. V. ROUTH]

THE literature of the late Victorian era is becoming sufficiently distant to assume a new and more permanent interest. But this growing attractiveness is not solely due to the rather qualified charm of increasing age. The more we are able to look back into the last forty years of the nineteenth century, the more we realize that the transition from that age to the twentieth century has not been all of a piece. As regards politics, society, economics, morals and *savoir-vivre*, we may consider all those to belong to the New Generation, who were not old enough to take an intelligent interest in the South African War. At the same time we are beginning to understand how far the ideas and ideals which inspire contemporary literature were already fermenting in this earlier age from which we feel that we have broken away. Thus the books of the two preceding generations are gradually being discovered anew, and future students of our own time will probably recognize an unbroken sequence of development from the reign of Victoria to the reign of George V or perhaps further.

For instance, the novels of Thomas Hardy are still a source of living interest to all readers and are of direct inspiration to some novelists. So it is gratifying that Mr. H. C. Duffin has brought out a second edition of *Thomas Hardy: a Study of the Wessex Novels*,¹ with the chapter entitled 'Development' happily omitted and an appendix on the poems and on *The Dynasts* added. The essay does not claim to revolutionize our ideas of the novelist.

¹ *Thomas Hardy: a Study of the Wessex Novels*. By H. C. Duffin. Longmans, Green & Co. 7s. 6d.

The critic gives much the picture of Hardy's thought, sentiment, and style that one would expect from a well-trained student; in fact his whole manner and view are slightly tinged by the academic tendency to discover in his author some subtle and rarified excellence which would otherwise escape the uninitiated. Besides, his style, though it tends to mellow as the work proceeds, continues to be fatiguingly egotistic and many little incontinences of thought from time to time irritate the reader. Yet the book is a distinct contribution to the subject. Mr. Duffin has a stimulating and suggestive way of illustrating Hardy by comparison with dramatists and poets of other ages and countries, and, if his judgement is sometimes immature and his method of praise undiscerning, he certainly has the power of kindling enthusiasm. Perhaps the most valuable feature of his book will be found in the vivid and penetrating descriptions which bring back certain of the novels so powerfully to the reader's mind, or send him to them afresh. If it is the business of a critic to reproduce the impression which an author makes upon him, so that others may catch fire from his heat, Mr. Duffin's book is well worth reading.

Another of the powers of our time is Samuel Butler. The steady-growth of his influence from almost complete obscurity probably illustrates (though it does not cause) important and far-reaching changes in the ideas of the twentieth century. Mr. Festing Jones, who did so much to establish that personality in *Samuel Butler, author of 'Erewhon'*, has during the last year, in collaboration with Mr. A. T. Bartholomew, supplemented this monumental work with *The Samuel Butler Collection at St. John's College, Cambridge*,² a catalogue of the philosopher's books, pictures, and personal effects, accompanied by a commentary full of quaint and rather illuminating anecdotes. Mr. Gosse has also included an article on Butler in *Aspects and Impressions* (to be noticed lower), but the most challenging and readable discussion appears in the preface to *Back to Methuselah*.³ The

² *The Samuel Butler Collection at St. John's College, Cambridge: A Catalogue and a Commentary.* By Henry Festing Jones and A. T. Bartholomew. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge. 7s. 6d.

³ *Back to Methuselah. A Metabiological Pentateuch.* By Bernard Shaw. Constable & Co. 10s.

publication of what Mr. Shaw calls a 'Metabiological Pentateuch', and which is really half a dialogue and half a dramatized legend concerning 'creative evolution', would hardly be expected to offer much guidance to students of late Victorian literature. But Darwin has had so much influence on the thought of that time and the reaction from Darwinism is so much a moving force of our own age, that a review of the conflict is, in any case, of more than scientific interest, and is of direct importance, because of the light which it throws on Butler's position. Mr. Shaw argues, in his Preface, that the doctrine of changing and adaptable species had been inculcated by Empedocles, Buffon, Linnaeus, Goethe, Erasmus Darwin, Treviranus, and by Lamarck. But the conviction had always prevailed that these changes and adaptations had proceeded according to some design and purpose. There was mind behind evolution. Darwin produced an alternative explanation. He argued that species originated by natural selection, that is, by accidental circumstances which enabled some types to survive and left others to perish. We need not dwell on the brilliant and whimsical pages describing the effect of this new doctrine. According to Mr. Shaw, the theory was eagerly embraced because it saved mankind from 'the pseudo-religious rubbish that had blocked every upward and onward path', and 'we were intellectually intoxicated with the idea that the world could make itself without design, purpose, skill, or intelligence: in short without life'. As a result, mind was banished from the universe; no place was left for free-will and for self-control; and 'though the false idea of God was destroyed, the True God was destroyed as well'. Thus the biological and evolutionary theories of the mid and late Victorian eras have produced 'the godless welter of the infidel half century'. But, like every other poison, Darwinism has provoked a reaction, and Mr. Shaw, whatever one may think of his other contentions, certainly does justice to the part which Butler played in denying that the Universe is without soul and that evolution is the result of blind, mechanical forces. Butler, Mr. Shaw continues, always insisted that vitality or the life-force was the real principle of adaptation to environment, but he never established this conviction. He attacked Neo-Darwinism, but put nothing into its place. Mr. Shaw then goes on to explain that *Back to Methuselah* is an

attempt to supply this defect. His aim is to establish the new religion of the creative life-force in the place of Darwinism, and he contends that, as in the case of all other religions, his end can be achieved only through the means of art. He is carrying on the work of Samuel Butler, but he must hark back to the old anthropomorphic beliefs and teach the truth by allegories and legends.

Samuel Butler and his opposition to Darwinism also inspire what are perhaps the most interesting pages of the eleventh series of *Shelburne Essays*.⁴ In broad outline Mr. More's view of the conflict is very similar to Mr. Shaw's, but when he turns to discuss the two 'Erewhons', he breaks fresh ground. He is particularly good on 'The Book of the Machines'. He shows how these three chapters (*Erewhon* xxiii-v) are part irony, part analogy, and part a recantation. Butler was at first so impressed by the plausible simplicity of the doctrine of natural selection that he began by believing machinery to have an independent racial existence. One day (he thought) it would surpass man in development and would threaten to exterminate him. But later the philosopher formed the opinion (as he explained in *Lucubratio Ebria*) that machines are only an extension of man's limbs—an elaboration of the tools which the mind invents in its progress towards a higher organization. As such they are the measure of inward growth and are not to be feared. These two apparently conflicting views, the one an analogy, the other its refutation, and both an ebullition of irony, were combined into 'The Book of the Machines' and the romance formed round them. But the second view was the one which he ultimately held. It contained the germ of his belief in 'the will to evolve' and grew into his teleological theory of evolution, which he expounded in *Life and Habit* (1877).

The other essays of *A New England Group* are not so interesting. However, Mr. More throws some light on Emerson's philosophy. Emerson, he admits, recognized the double nature of experience, but yet he does not seem to have accepted more than one single unalterable reality: the presence and inspiration

⁴ *A New England Group and Others*, by Paul Elmore More. Constable & Co. 8s.

of God. Emerson ignored what most of us would regard as the other reality, the activity of sin. He seems to have regarded evil as an evasive and unsubstantial impression, a kind of illusion, which did not penetrate to man's inner consciousness. Mr. More then goes on to treat us to an amusing account of what happened when Bronson Alcott endeavoured to put this theory into practice at 'Fruitlands'. The chapters on *Charles Norton* and on *Economic Ideals* are worth perusing, and those who concern themselves with the oldest English University should read the searching and rather ironical inquiry in *Oxford, Women, and God*. There are suggestive ideas scattered through the pages of these and the other essays, but the greater part of the book goes no further than literary gossip and cultured reminiscences concerned with picturesque and minor figures.

Other Americans have published books on modern literature. Mr. Carl Van Doren in *The American Novel*⁵ traces its origin from the earliest days of the Puritan opposition, through the embryonic stages of the frontier tales, and the initiation of the 'dime' novel by Beadle and Adams of New York, down to our own day. He tells how the domestic sentimentalists, whose best work is still accessible in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, held the field till the publication of General Wallace's *Ben Hur* in 1880. He gives a highly appreciative account of W. D. Howells' talents and many activities, without losing sight of his limitations. He takes the opportunity to explain how, after the Civil War, America felt that she ought to have a national epic, not in the antiquated style, but some great imaginative composition which would express her rapid development and manifold pursuits. Mr. Van Doren realizes how nearly Mark Twain rose to the great occasion in *Life on the Mississippi* (1883), and how buoyantly he still responded to the pulse of national life when he composed his masterpiece, *Huckleberry Finn*, (1885). But his natural genius and vitality led him into other less glorious fields. *Finn* developed into a rollicking study of boy character, and in later life, after many speculations and financial adventures, its author gave way to the moodiness and disillusionment which found full

⁵ *The American Novel*. By Carl Van Doren. The Macmillan Company, New York.

expression in *The Mysterious Stranger*. The historian passes on to the work of Henry James, and gives a very readable account of his career, tracing the phases of the novelist's development and drawing attention to James's struggle for a wider public recognition. But it is to be doubted whether Mr. Van Doren fully appreciates the psychological insight of his later novels. In the limited space of the present survey it is impossible to give an idea of the field which Mr. Van Doren covers. He considers the eighties to be the period of greatest quantity and of finest quality, and he takes Marion Crawford as the representative of its defects and excellences. But the work of Howells and of James mark 'the most refined, and on the whole, the most artistic moment in the history of the American novel'. There then followed two reactions: on the one hand a tendency towards historical romance, and on the other hand an insistence on realism. The romances are characterized by pseudo-archaic phraseology and by genteel sentiments, such as are found in S. Weir Mitchell's *Hugh Wynne*. The movement towards realism is more interesting, even if not always more successful. A feeling had gained force in America that the novel ought to be a powerful agent in the progress of civilization, and that it could most effectively fulfil this function by exposing and condemning every practice that thwarted progress. So novelists began to cultivate 'naturalism'. The most brilliant exponent of this school was Frank Norris (1870-1902), not only because he exposed all the passions and vices aroused by the business of producing and distributing the vast food supplies of the West, but because he caught something of the epic spirit of the States and portrayed in his eloquent if somewhat turgid pages the profounder though less lovely instincts of human nature. Had the author of *The Octopus* and *The Pit* lived to reach maturity, America might at last have found a national voice.

Thus *The American Novel* is a distinct contribution to the subject. The work is particularly welcome because the author dwells so insistently on the idea of development. He avoids the academic error of ascribing too much importance to English influence and, at the same time, he escapes the popular weakness of magnifying his own country's achievement. He realizes that the American novel is a product of American civilization, but

that neither of them has yet found its true path. One can only wish that he had discussed with more insight that essentially American institution, the short story. Strictly speaking, a volume of tales ought not to be classed as a novel, but our idea of transatlantic fiction would have been more complete.

While Mr. Van Doren has confined himself severely to his own country, Professor W. L. Phelps has brought out a volume on the dramatists of England, America, Belgium, and France. *Essays on Modern Dramatists*⁶ is written in a racy conversational style, stamped with the author's personality. The book is not only readable; it is stimulating, because the author puts so much enthusiasm into his judgements and justifies his admiration with such vivid descriptions and persuasive arguments. Yet one cannot help feeling that this appreciative play-goer will meet with as many dissenters as disciples. He thinks that Sir James Barrie 'has done more to elevate the English stage than any other man of our time', and he claims that Sir James's masterpiece is *The Admirable Crichton*, and is 'the greatest English drama of modern times'. But when in the next essay he turns to Mr. Shaw, he does not trouble to discuss the Shavian comedies. He considers the quality of his mind without exploring its contents, and concludes that the dramatist is so compact of clear reason and so purged of romance that he is to be read, not for his art or his ideas, but only as a stimulant to thought. Professor Phelps's sympathetic study of Galsworthy deals with a dramatist outside the limits of this article, but in his third essay on W. Clyde Fitch he gives a delightful sketch of the American's personality and of his struggle to fame, and declares *Beau Brummell* (1890) to be the beginning of the modern American drama. Yet when we read on to learn what the playwright has really achieved and contributed to his art, Professor Phelps becomes elusive, and we are forced to the conclusion that even Fitch's other best plays (*The Truth*, *The Girl with the Green Eyes*, *The City*), though they have ideas, are eminent chiefly for lack of competitors. On the whole, the reader of these or the remaining essays will meet with more amusement than help in the study of the drama. Yet

⁶ *Essays on Modern Dramatists*. By Professor W. L. Phelps. The Macmillan Company, New York. \$ 2.50.

Professor Phelps is too shrewd, a connoisseur to write a whole book on his favourite subject without dropping some valuable hints. The student will do well to meditate on his reminder that the most unpopular and commercially unsuccessful dramatists sometimes exercise most influence on the development of the drama and that a good fifth act is the rarest of excellences.

Yet one other of the founders of the twentieth century has been discussed during the last year. Mr. J. Bruce Glasier, the veteran lecturer and Socialist agitator, has devoted some of the last days of his life to the task of recording his recollections of William Morris.⁷ The book is intended as a legacy to the Socialist movement, and may not at first sight seem to be of any special value to a student of literature. In fact Morris's prose and poetry are hardly mentioned—certainly not discussed—though his religious and social convictions are expounded clearly and enthusiastically. Yet the book is well worth reading, even by the most exclusive of academic specialists. To begin with, the last forty years of the nineteenth century, unlike our own age, was a time when ideas were associated with strong personalities, and this memoir, with its store of anecdotes, will give the reader a good notion of a type of character which really impressed our fathers. But there is another and deeper reason why the record should be welcomed. Morris was an early type of the new literary man. Unlike Tennyson, Browning, Dobell, Rossetti, FitzGerald, and their followers, he did not make artistic expression the object of his life. The real secret of his genius was a kind of neo-humanism; an enthusiasm for his fellow-creatures; a passion for creating and sharing happiness. The triumph of socialism, the dissemination of ideas, and the production of literature were for him only the nearest and most effective means to this end. Although by profession a poet, romancer, artist, dyer, printer, upholsterer, cabinet-maker, glass-designer, architect, and agitator, he was really by nature and at heart a humanitarian moralist. This tendency to make literature subserve comradeship continues increasingly to influence our own generation. Authors do not, of course, consciously inspire themselves from Morris, but

⁷ *William Morris and the Early Days of the Socialist Movement.* By J. Bruce Glasier. Longmans, Green & Co. 6s. 6d.

since the dawn of the twentieth century they seem more and more to be taking his view of art. As Howells says of Tolstoy, 'He taught me to see life not as a chase of a for ever impossible personal happiness, but as a field for endeavour towards the happiness of the whole human family.' In fact, novelists are beginning to introduce the type itself into their creations, as witness the one charming and original character in *If Winter Comes*. Mr. Glasier is at no special pains to emphasize this aspect of his hero's career; nor should he, as his book claims only to describe a Socialist reformer, and in any case Morris never aimed at creating a school. But the tendency is in our own time unmistakable, and even in these pages Morris stands out as its prototype.

Most of the books which have so far been discussed deal with authors who are at this day unmistakably powers in the land. We now come to an earnest and in some respects very able piece of criticism, devoted to one of the most neglected of Victorian poets. In this age of intensive study, a champion falls sooner or later to the lot of every writer, however obscure, and Coventry Patmore has at last found an uncompromising and whole-hearted apologist in Mr. O. Burdett.⁸ Mr. Burdett finds in *The Angel in the House* a new doctrine that amounts to a philosophy of life: that the consummation of love is possible only to a lover who is a husband and to a woman who is that lover's wife. Nay more, this consummation is the only state in which man's natural goodness and nobility can come to the surface and find their scope. Those who complain that a prosaic courtship continued in decorous married life is too homely a subject for serious literature, fail to see (Mr. Burdett argues) that herein lies Patmore's chief claim to originality; he has founded a system and an ideal on a series of commonplace experiences. Those again who complain that verse is not the proper medium with which to expound these theories, forget that such ideas contain 'the primary simplicities' which are the province of poetry. If *The Angel in the House* contains a philosophy, *The Unknown Eros* contains a religion, or at any rate the commentary on a religion. Love-making is sometimes regarded as very human if

⁸ *The Idea of Coventry Patmore*. By O. Burdett. H. Milford. 7s. 6d.

not humorous, and so it should be regarded, except that the relations between honourable lovers are an analogy, or rather an actual reflection of God's love for the soul. In fact, in his prose essay *Dieu et ma Dame*, Patmore summarizes the familiar signs of earthly love and argues that the analogy with heavenly love becomes an identity. After Mr. Burdett has thus set himself to show that the foregoing works present the study of a pair of lovers before and after marriage, and also illustrate their relation to both earthly and heavenly love, he turns to the hard sayings of *The Rod, the Root, and the Flower*, and argues that these essays really continue the same subject and portray the inner constitution of man's spirit in itself. This interpretation is expounded with lucidity and enthusiasm, but Mr. Burdett is no mystic so absorbed in the contemplation of his author that he cannot realize the complexities and requirements of his own age. On the contrary, he feels that the world of thought at the present time is suffering from a state of disorder because it lacks belief in some general theory, and he claims that Patmore's philosophy of life, rooted in a superrational yet familiar physical experience, will supply the guiding influence which is needed. In so condensed a review as the present, there is no room to discuss Patmore's tenets, or even to give an opinion on Mr. Burdett's strenuous advocacy of them. It is barely possible to put the reader in possession of his conclusions. As a philosopher 'it was Coventry Patmore's peculiar vocation to meditate on the nature of love and to find in that mystery the clue to every problem'; as an artist 'perhaps the chief contribution of his poetry was not only to rescue modern life for the epic, but to add to the traditional and splendid music of the epic the hitherto absent cadence of a still small voice'. If a thinker and artist of this order (whom Mr. Burdett in one connexion compares to Plato and Dante) has been neglected, it is because he ignored the claims of friendship, with which nuptial love is unquestionably at variance, because the present age distrusts marriage and because art is now prized too much as an escape from actuality. Such are some of Mr. Burdett's views, yet the most sympathetic reader, after closing his eloquent and learned pages, will still wonder why Patmore clung so obstinately to narrative verse instead of attempting something more in the manner of Meredith's *Modern Love* or *In Memoriam*.

Besides the treatise on Patmore, several verse anthologies have appeared, but they either gather their flowers from all the periods, like Mr. John Drinkwater's *The Way of Poetry*⁹ (whose charming little introduction should be read by every boy and girl in the English-speaking world), or else they make their selections from twentieth-century literature, like *An Anthology of Recent Poetry for Schools*,¹⁰ or Mr. G. N. Pocock's excellent selection in *The King's Treasuries of Literature*.¹¹ But among the essays in Professor Federico Olivero's *Studies in Modern Poetry*,¹² a collection of papers dealing for the most part with French literature, there is a rather fragmentary essay *On Swinburne's Atalanta in Calydon*. The Turin professor, in florid but surprisingly expressive English, dwells on the usual aspects of Swinburne's revolt, indicates a few imitations or parallels from Sophocles and Ovid, and asserts, without substantiating, that a tendency towards Greek art was a striking feature of the Pre-Raphaelite movement. He concludes that *Atalanta* 'does not attain the supreme heights of poetry, because it lacks "mystery", that depth of thought and passion "which passeth show" and cannot be clearly expressed even by the greatest masters of art, but which is admirably suggested in their loftiest passages'.

The reader will also find three delightfully written essays on Victorian literature among the papers in Mr. Gosse's *Aspects and Impressions*.¹³ But as the aspect is nearly always biographical and the impression almost exclusively personal, these *causeries*, apart from their charming style, mainly serve as introductions or supplements to their subjects. Students will be grateful for the discussion on George Eliot's decline in popularity and for the quotation that she was 'the emblem of a generation distracted between the intense need of believing and the difficulty of belief'. They will also be glad of the explanation why Samuel Butler

⁹ *The Way of Poetry*. John Drinkwater. The New World Series. Collins's Clear Type Press. 7s. 6d. net.

¹⁰ *An Anthology of Recent Poetry*. Compiled by L. D'O. Walters. G. Harrap & Co. 1s. 6d., &c.

¹¹ *Modern Poetry*. Edited by Guy N. Pocock, M.A. Messrs. Dent. 1s. 9d.

¹² *Studies in Modern Poetry*. By Federico Olivero. H. Milford. 7s. 6d.

¹³ *Aspects and Impressions*. By Edmund Gosse. Cassell. 7s. 6d.

so strongly disliked Vergil, Dante, Tennyson, Titian, Leonardo Raffaello, Michael Angelo, Beethoven, Bach, and Mozart; and they will be interested to trace the part played by Miss Eliza Mary Ann Savage in *The Way of All Flesh*. The best essay in the whole collection is the brilliantly written sketch of Henry James's life, largely based on personal knowledge, which traces with the utmost clearness and sympathy the stages by which the novelist came at last to find his place in the scheme of things. Would that Mr. Gosse had found space or inclination to shed more light on James's intellectual development!

INDEX

- Abercrombie, L., on Keats's *Hyperion*, 167.
- Ainslie, Douglas, translation of Croce's *Ariosto*, *Shakespeare*, and *Corneille*, 71-3.
- Alexander, Sir William, Earl of Stirling, *Poetical Works*, 90-2.
- Amos, Flora Ross, *Early Theories of Translation*, 13-14.
- Anything for a Quiet Life*, 96.
- Appius and Virginia*, 95-6.
- Aronstein, Philip, on the life and poetry of John Donne, 108.
- Bailey, John, *The Poet of Stillness* (Keats), 169.
- Baker, R. P., *A History of English-Canadian Literature to the Confederation*, 11-12.
- Bartholomew, A. T.: see Jones, H. F.
- Bax, Clifford: see Rubinstein, H. F.
- Bayne, Rev. R., transcription of the *Life of Fisher* (Harleian MS.), 47-8.
- Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster*, 97-8.
- Behn, Mrs. Aphra, 117.
- Béowulf*, ed. R. W. Chambers, 33-5; trans. C. K. Scott-Moncrieff, 35-6.
- Berdan, J. M., *Early Tudor Poetry, 1485-1547*, 54-8.
- Birkhead, Edith, *The Tale of Terror, A Study of the Gothic Romance*, 139.
- Birth of Merlin, The*, 97.
- Blake, William, 141-2.
- Blore, G. H., *Victorian Worthies*, 156-7.
- Blunden, E., and Porter, A., *The Poems of John Clare*, 171.
- Boas, F. S., *An Introduction to the Reading of Shakspeare*, 67-8; on Keats's sonnet, *On First Looking into Chapman's Homer*, 168.
- Bradley, A. C., *Keats and 'Philosophy'*, 168.
- Braines, W. W., *The Site of the Globe Playhouse, Southwark*, 80.
- Brawley, B., *A Short History of the English Drama*, 11.
- Brett-Smith, H. F. B., ed. Drayton's *Nymphidia*, 110.
- Broadus, E. K., *The Laureateship, a Study of the Office of Poet Laureate in England*, 9-11, 117-19.
- Brome, Richard, 88.
- Brontë, Anne, *Poems*, 174.
- Brown, A. C. L., *The Grail and the English Sir Perceval*, 58.
- Brown, Basil, *Law Sports at Gray's Inn*, 82-3.
- Brown, F. K., *Marlowe and Kyd*, 86.
- Brown, J. W., on MS. song-books, compiled by Thomas Smith, 110-111.
- Brown, S. J., *The Realm of Poetry*, 18-19.
- Bryan, W. F., *The Midland Present Plural Indicative ending e(n)*, 50-1.
- Burdett, O., *The Idea of Coventry Patmore*, 183-4.
- Burns, Robert, 143-4.
- Butler, Samuel, 176-8.
- Byrne, M. St. Clare, *Anthony Munday and his Books*, 83-4.
- Byron, Lord, 163-4.
- Campbell, O. J., *Sentimental Morality in Wordsworth's Narrative Poetry*, 160-1.
- Captives, The; or, The Lost Recovered*, 94-5.
- Carlyle, Thomas, 151-2, 172-3.
- Carré, J. M., *Goethe en Angleterre*, 172-3.
- Cazamian, L., *L'Évolution psychologique et la Littérature en Angleterre*, 154-6.
- Chambers, R. W., *Béowulf: an Introduction*, 33-5.
- Chambrun, Comtesse de, *Giovanni Florio, Un Apôtre de la Renaissance en Angleterre*, 60-2.

INDEX

- Chancellor, E. Beresford, *The Eighteenth Century in London: An Account of its Social Life and Arts*, 147-8.
- Charlemagne (*The Distracted Emperor*), 93-4.
- Chapton, H. B.: see Kastner, L. E.
- Child, Harold, 68.
- Cibber, Colley, *The Careless Husband*, 125-6.
- Clare, John, 171.
- Clark, A. M., *The Authorship of 'Appius and Virginia'*, 95-6.
- Cleveland, John, 109.
- Colvin, Sir S., on an autograph MS. of Keats's *Ode to the Nightingale*, 167.
- Conway, R. S., on the classical elements in Shakespeare's *Tempest*, 76.
- Crane, R., and Smith, R. J., *A French Influence on Goldsmith's 'Citizen of the World'*, 137.
- Crawford, S. J., ed. *Exameron Anglice, or the Old English Hexameron*, 40.
- Croce, B., *Ariosto, Shakespeare, and Corneille*, 71-3.
- Croll, M. W., *Attic Prose in the Seventeenth Century*, 113.
- Crowne, John, 123-5; *Sir Courtly Nice*, 123-4.
- Cruikshank, A. H., *Thomas Parnell, or What was wrong with the Eighteenth Century*, 137-8.
- Dane, Clemence, *Will Shakespeare: An Invention in Four Acts*, 78-9.
- Danielowski, Emma, *Die Journale der frühen Quäker*, 131-2.
- Day, Mabel, ed. *The Wheatley Manuscript*, 49.
- de Selincourt, E., Warton Lecture on Keats, 166.
- Dixon, M.: see Grant, W.
- Dobson, Austin, *Later Essays*, 1917-20, 138-9.
- Donne, John, 108.
- Draper, J. W., *Aristotelian 'Mimesis' in England*, 138; *The Theory of Translation in the Eighteenth Century*, 138.
- Drayton, Michael, *Nimphidia*, 110.
- Drinkwater, John, *The War of Poetry*, 185.
- Dubislav, G., *Studien zur mittelenglischen Syntax*, 50.
- Duffin, H. C., *Thomas Hardy: a Study of the Wessex Novels*, 175-6.
- Eccles, F. Y., *Rabine in England*, 123.
- Edwards, Thomas, 102.
- Einstein, L., *Tudor Ideals*, 54.
- Ellis, G. R., *The Real Tragedy of Keats*, 169-70.
- Elton, Oliver, *A Survey of English Literature, 1830-80*, 149-54.
- Emerson, O. F., *Imperfect Lines in 'Pearl' and the Rimed Parts of 'Sir Gawain'*, 52. See also Whigam, R. G.
- English, *The Teaching of, in England: Report of the Departmental Committee of the Board of Education*, 23-4.
- Exameron Anglice, ed. S. J. Crawford, 40.
- Falls, Cyril, on Andrew Marvell, 110.
- Farinelli, Arturo, *Lord Byron*, 163-4.
- Farrant, Richard, 81-2.
- Field, Nathaniel, 97.
- Finch, M. B., and Peers, E. Allison, *Walpole's Relations with Voltaire*, 141.
- Fisher, Cardinal John, *Life*, 47-8.
- Flatman, Thomas, 109, 110.
- Florio, John, *Life and Works*, 60-2.
- Floyer, J. K., *Some Emblem Books and their Writers*, 111.
- Foerster, Max, *Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen*, 36-7.
- Ford, John, 96-7.
- Fraser, Sir J. G., *Sir Roger de Coverley and Other Literary Pieces*, 134.
- Freeman, A. M., *Vanessa and her Correspondence with Jonathan Swift*, 128-30.
- Friedlander, G., *Shakespeare and the Jew*, 75.
- Fripp, E. I.: see Savage, R.
- Funke, O., *Zur Wortgeschichte der französischen Elemente in Englischen*, 49.
- Furnivall, F. J., ed. *The Guild of St. Mary, Lichfield*, 47.
- Gaselee, S., *Samuel Pepys' Spanish Books*, 124.
- Gay, John, *Life and Letters*, 135; *The Beggar's Opera*, 130.
- Gesta Grayorum*, 82.
- Glasier, J. Bruce, *William Morris and the Early Days of the Socialist Movement*, 182-3.

- Glicksman, H., *The Stage History of Colley Cibber's 'The Careless Husband'*, 125-6.
- Goethe, 172-3.
- Goffe, Thomas, *Careless Shepherdess*, 88.
- Gollancz, Sir I., ed. *Pearl*, 43-4; *The Middle Ages in the Lineage of English Poetry*, 45-6.
- Görlicke, W., *Das Bildungsideal bei Addison und Steele*, 132-3.
- Gosse, Edmund, *Aspects and Impressions*, 185-6.
- Graham, W., *Politics of the Greater Romantic Poets*, 156.
- Grant, W., and Dixon, M., *Manual of Modern Scots*, 30-2.
- Graves, T. S., *Notes on Puritanism and the Stage*, 98-9.
- Greene, Robert, *The Scottish History of James the Fourth*, 87.
- Greg, W. W., 87, 92; *The First Edition of Ben Jonson's 'Every Man out of his Humour'*, 87-8.
- Grierson, H. J. C., *Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century*, 113-14.
- Gwynn, Nell, *Elegy on*, 116.
- Hamilton, General Ian, 166-7.
- Hanford, J. H., *Milton and the Art of War*, 106-7.
- Hardy, Thomas, 175-6.
- Harper, G. McLean, *Wordsworth's French Daughter*, 157-8.
- Hart, Charles, the actor, 117.
- Hearnshaw, F. J. C., ed. *Mediaeval Contributions to Modern Civilization*, 45.
- Hecht, Hans, *Daniel Webb, ein Beitrag zur englischen Aesthetik des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 130-1.
- Heminge, William, *On the Time-Poets*, 111.
- Hendrix, W. S., *Quevedo, Guevara, La Sage, and The Tatler*, 134.
- Herford, C. H., *Mountain Scenery in Keats*, 169; *Shakespeare's Treatment of Love and Marriage, and other Essays*, 19-20.
- Herrick, Robert, *Poetical Works*, 110.
- Heusler, A., *Das nordische Altertum in seiner Beziehung zum westgermanischen*, 29.
- Heywood, Thomas, *Appius and Virginia*, 95-6; *The Captives; or, The Lost Recovered*, 94-5.
- Hickey, Emily, *The Making of English Blank Verse*, 62-3.
- Hillebrand, H. N., *The Early History of the Chapel Royal*, 63.
- Hines, J. A., *Further Interpretations of Milton*, 105-6.
- Hitchcock, Elsie V., ed. *The Do-net of Reginald Pecock*, 48-9.
- Holthausen, F., ed. *Vices and Virtues*, 49.
- Hübener, Herr, *Das Problem des Flexionsschwundes im ags.*, 39-40.
- Hulbert, J. R., *The 'West Midland' of the Romances*, 51-2.
- Jakobsen, J., *Etymologisk Ordbog over det norrøne Sprog på Shetland*, 30.
- Jente, R., *Die Mythologischen Ausdrücke im altenglischen Wortschatz*, 37-8.
- Jespersen, O., *Engelsk Fonetik*, 30; *Language: its Nature, Development and Origin*, 25-7.
- Jones, H. F., and Bartholomew, A. T., *The Samuel Butler Collection at St. John's College, Cambridge*, 176.
- Jones, R. Foster, *Lewis Theobald, his Contribution to English Scholarship*, 135-7.
- Jonson, Ben, *Catiline*, 88; *Every Man out of his Humour*, 87-8; *Pro-ludium to the Epode in The Forrest*, 88.
- Judson, A. C., ed. Heywood's *The Captives*, 94-5.
- Jusserand, J. J., *English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages*, 46-7.
- Kastner, L. E., and Charlton, H. B., ed. *The Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling*, 90-2.
- Kaye, F. B., *The Writings of Bernard Mandeville*, 134-5.
- Keats, John, 166-71.
- Keats Memorial Volume*, 166-9.
- Ker, W. P., on Keats's *Hyperion*, 167.
- Keynes, G., *Bibliography of Blake*, 142-3.
- Killigrew, Thomas, *The Parson's Wedding*, 123-4.
- King, Henry, 109.
- Kyd, Thomas, 86.
- Lamb, Charles, 163.
- Landor, Walter Savage, 161-2.

- Lathrop, H. B., *The Art of the Novelist*, 20-1.
- Lawrence, W. J., *Early Substantive Masques*, 98; *The Earliest Private-Theatre Play*, 81-2; *The Riddle of 'Philaster'*, 97-8.
- Leach, H. G., *Angevin Britain and Scandinavia*, 29.
- Légouis, Émile, *The Early Life of Wordsworth, 1770-98; a Study of 'The Prelude'*, 158-9.
- Lichfield, *The Guild of St. Mary at*, 47.
- Liljegen, S. B., *Bemerkungen zur Biographie Milton's*, 205; *Studies in Milton*, 103-5.
- Lilley, J. P., *Wordsworth's Interpretation of Nature*, 161.
- Lindkvist, H., *On the Origin and History of the English Pronoun She*, 30, 50.
- Littledale, H., 92.
- Lovelace, Ralph Milbanke, Earl of, *Astarte*, ed. Mary, Countess of Lovelace, 163.
- Lovelace, Richard, *Poems*, 111.
- Lubbock, P., *The Craft of Fiction*, 21-3.
- Lucas, E. V., *The Life of Charles Lamb*, 163.
- Luick, K., *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, 30.
- McIntyre, Clara F., *Were the 'Gothic Novels' Gothic?*, 140.
- Mackail, J. W., on Keats's *Endymion*, 168.
- McLachlan, H., *Letters of Theophilus Lindsey*, 132.
- McNaught, D., *The Truth about Burns*, 143-4.
- Madariaga, Salvador de, *Shelley and Calderón, and other Essays on English and Spanish poetry*, 164-5.
- Malone Society Reprints, 87-8, 92-3.
- Malory, Sir T., *La Morte d'Arthur*, 44-5.
- Marlowe, Christopher, 84-6; *Doctor Faustus*, 84-5; *The Jew of Malta*, 85-6.
- Marvell, Andrew, 110.
- Melville, L., *The Life and Letters of John Gay*, 135.
- Middleton, Thomas, 96.
- Milton, John, 103-8.
- Montague, Walter, *The Shepherds Paradise*, 89.
- Moore, C. A., *The Conclusion of 'Paradise Lost'*, 105.
- Moore, S., *Grammatical and Natural Gender in Middle English*, 49-50.
- Moorman, F. W., *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick*, 110.
- More, P. E., *A New England Group and Others*, 178-9.
- Morgan, F., *The Virtue of Temperance in the 'Faerie Queene'*, 101.
- Morley, Edith J., *Joseph Warton's Criticism of Pope*, 137.
- Morris, William, 182-3.
- Moscovitch, M., 75.
- Munday, Anthony, 83-4.
- Mustard, W. P., 88.
- Mutschmann, H., *Der ander Milton*, 103-5.
- Neaste of Wasps*, A, 109.
- Newbolt, Sir H., ed. *An English Anthology of Prose and Poetry*, 7-8.
- Notcutt, H. C., *The Story of Glaucus in Keats's 'Endymion'*, 170-1.
- Odell, G. C. D., *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, 66-7.
- Olivero, Federico, *Studies in Modern Poetry*, 185.
- Omond, T. S., *A Study of Metre*, 14-15; *English Metrists*, 15.
- Ord, H., *Chaucer and the Rival Poet in Shakespeare's Sonnets*, 75.
- Osborne, Dorothy, *Letters*, 114-15.
- Pálmer, H. E., *The Principles of Language-Study*, 27.
- Parry, J. J., *A Seventeenth-Century Gallery of Poets*, 111.
- Patmore, Coventry, 183-4.
- Patton, Julia, *The English Village, A Literary Study, 1750-1850*, 146-7.
- Paul, F. B., *Milton's Samson Agonistes*, 106.
- Paul, H., *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 30; *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, 30.
- Pearl*, 43-4.
- Peck, W. E., *Shelley and the Abbé Barruel*, 165-6.
- Pecock, Reginald, *The Donet*, 48-9.
- Peers, E. Allison: see Finch, M. B.
- Pepys, Samuel, *Spanish collections of*, 124.
- Perromat, C., *William Wycherley: Sa Vie—Son Œuvre*, 119-22.

- Perry, Bliss, *A Study of Poetry*, 17-18.
- Phelps, W. L., *Essays on Modern Dramatists*, 181-2; ed. *The Poems of Richard Lovelace*, 111.
- Pocock, G. N., ed. *Modern Poetry*, 185.
- Pollard, A. W., 70, 78.
- Porter, A.: see Blunden, E.
- Poston, M. L., *The Origin of the Heroic Play*, 126-7.
- Pound, Louise, *Poetic Origins and the Ballad*, 15-17.
- Pourtales, Guy de, trans. Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure*, 76-7.
- Pyre, J. F. A., *The Formation of Tennyson's Style*, 173-4.
- Queen, The, or the Excellency of her Sex*, 96.
- Quiller-Couch, Sir A. T., and Wilson, J. Dover, edd. *The New Shakespeare*, 63-71.
- Racine, J., 123.
- Ralli, A., *A Guide to Carlyle*, 172.
- Rastell, John, the printer, 64.
- Ravenscroft, Edward, *The London Cuckolds*, 123-4.
- Reed, A. W., *John Rastell, Printer, Lawyer, Venturer, Dramatist, and Controversialist*, 64; *The Regulation of the Book Trade before the Proclamation of 1538*, 64-5.
- Reynolds, Myra, *The Learned Lady in England, 1650-1760*, 144-6.
- Rollins, H. E., *A Contribution to the History of the English Commonwealth Drama*, 99-100.
- Rubinstein, H. F., and Bax, Clifford, *Shakespeare: A Play in Five Episodes*, 77-8.
- Saintsbury, G., ed. *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period*, 109-10.
- Sampson, J., ed. *The Poems of William Blake*, 141-2.
- Saurat, D., *Blake and Milton*, 142; *Les Sources anglaises de la Pensée de Milton*, 102-3; *Milton et le Zohar*, 102-3.
- Savage, R., and Fripp, E. I., *Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-upon-Avon and Other Records 1553-1620*, 79.
- Schoell, F. L., *Charlemagne (The Distracted Emperor)*, 93-4.
- Scott, Sir Walter, 162-3.
- Scott-Moncrieff, C. K., *Beowulf* (trans.), 35-6.
- Scudder, Vida D., *La Morte d'Arthur of Sir Thomas Malory*, 44-5.
- Seaton, Ethel, *Marlowe and his Authorities*, 86.
- Shackford, Martha H., *The Eve of St. Agnes, and The Mysteries of Udolpho*, 140-1, 171.
- Shakespeare, William, 66-80; *Measure for Measure*, French translation of, 76-7; *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 69; *The Tempest*, 76; *The New Shakespeare*, 63-71.
- Shaw, G. Bernard, *Back to Methuselah: a Metabiological Pentateuch*, 176-8.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 164-6.
- Shirley, James, *Ode upon the Happy Return of King Charles II*, 116.
- Shorter, C., ed. *The Complete Poems of Anne Brontë*, 174.
- Sidney, Sir Philip, *Astrophel and Stella*, 101.
- Simpson, P., 70; *The 1604 Text of Marlowe's 'Doctor Faustus'*, 84-5.
- Sisam, K., *Fourteenth-Century Verse and Prose*, 41-2.
- Skelton, John, 63-4.
- Smart, J. S., *The Sonnets of Milton*, 107-8.
- Smith, G. C. Moore, *New Light on Dorothy Osborne's Letters*, 114-15.
- Smith, L. Toulmin, trans. Jusserand's *English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages*, 46-7.
- Smith, R. J.: see Crane, R.
- Smith, Thomas, two MS. song-books compiled by, 110-11.
- Snell, A. R., on the allegory of Spenser's *Muioipotmos*, 101.
- Spenser, Edmund, 101.
- Spielmann, M. H., *Shakespeare Treads the Boards*, 77.
- Stalker, A., *The Intimate Life of Sir Walter Scott*, 162-3.
- Stanley, Thomas, 109.
- Steadman, J. M., *The Fate of Winnere and Wastoure*, 52.
- Stopes, Mrs., biographical sketch of Thomas Edwards, 102.
- Stratford-upon-Avon, Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of, and Other Records 1553-1620*, 79.
- Strong, A. T., *A Short History of English Literature*, 9.